

FOR USE IN LIBRARY ONLY.



PER BV 4070 .P712 v.1-10 c.2
Princeton Theological
Seminary.
The Princeton Seminary
bulletin

Copy 2

FOR USE IN LIBRARY ONLY.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<https://archive.org/details/princetonseminar9319prin>

The Princeton Seminary Bulletin

Published Quarterly by the Trustees of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church
Entered as second class matter, May 1, 1907, at the post office at Princeton, N. J.,
under the Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Vol. IX

PRINCETON, N. J., NOVEMBER, 1915

No. 3

THE INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT STEVENSON AND PROFESSOR SMITH.

In the presence of a gathering which completely filled the historic First Presbyterian Church of Princeton, on Wednesday morning, October 13, the Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., LL.D., was inaugurated as President of the Seminary and Professor of the History of Religion and Christian Missions, and the Rev. J. Ritchie Smith, D.D., as Professor of Homiletics. In addition to the Directors, the Trustees, the Faculty, the student body and a large gathering of the alumni and other friends of the Seminary, nearly eighty institutions of higher learning were represented at the ceremony by official delegates. The Rev. Maitland Alexander, D.D., LL.D., President of the Board of Directors, presided. The Scripture lesson was read by the Rev. John F. Patterson, D.D., and prayer offered by the Rev. George Alexander, D.D. After the Rev. J. Ritchie Smith, D.D., the professor-elect, had subscribed to the required formula, the charge was delivered by the Rev. William L. McEwan, D.D., This was followed by the inaugural address. Professor Smith selected as his topic "The Place of Homiletics in the Training of the Minister." The Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., then subscribed to the formula and a charge was delivered to him by the Rev. Francis L. Patton, D.D., President Emeritus of the Seminary. President Stevenson then delivered the inaugural address on the subject "Theological Education in the Light of Present-Day Demands." After the singing of a hymn, the benediction was pronounced by the Rev. Sylvester W. Beach, D.D.

At one o'clock luncheon was served to the guests of the Seminary at the Casino, and at the close of the luncheon a number of addresses were delivered. The Rev. Russell Cecil, D.D., President of the Alumni Association of the Seminary presided. The speakers at the luncheon were as follows:

President John Grier Hibben, Ph.D., LL.D., of Princeton University.

Dean Melancthon W. Jacobus, D.D., LL.D., of Hartford Theological Seminary.

President James G. K. McClure, D.D., LL.D., of McCormick Theological Seminary.

The Reverend Samuel M. Zwemer, D.D., of Cairo, Egypt.

President Walter W. Moore, D.D., LL.D., of Union Theological Seminary, Richmond.

Ex-President Francis L. Patton, D.D., LL.D., of Princeton University and of Princeton Theological Seminary.

The charge to Professor Smith, and the charge to President Stevenson and the speeches delivered at the luncheon are printed below, and also portions of the inaugural addresses. The complete inaugurals will appear in the January number of *The Princeton Theological Review*.

The list of official delegates was as follows:

Harvard University and Harvard Divinity School

The Reverend George Foot Moore D.D. LL.D. Professor of the
History of Religion

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

Yale University, The School of Religion
 Dean Charles R. Brown D.D.

Princeton University
 President John Grier Hibben Ph.D. LL.D.
 The Reverend Simon J. McPherson D.D. LL.D.

Washington and Lee University
 The Reverend J. R. Howerton D.D. LL.D. Professor of
 Philosophy

Columbia University
 The Reverend Raymond C. Knox S.T.B. Chaplain of the University

Brown University
 Henry Thatcher Fowler Ph.D. Professor of Biblical Literature
 and History

Rutgers College
 The Reverend George Hubbard Payson D.D. Professor of
 Ethics and Evidences of Christianity

Dartmouth College
 The Reverend Benjamin T. Marshall B.D. A.M. Professor of
 Biblical History and Literature

Washington and Jefferson College
 President Frederick W. Hinitt Ph.D. D.D.

Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America
 President J. P. Searle D.D. LL.D.
 The Reverend John H. Raven D.D. Professor of Old Testament
 Language and Exegesis

The University of Pittsburgh
 Chancellor Samuel Black McCormick D.D. LL.D.
 The Reverend S. B. Linhart D.D. Secretary of the University

Williams College
 The Reverend George G. Smith D.D.

Union College
 President Charles Alexander Richmond D.D. LL.D.
 The Reverend George Alexander D.D.
 Silas B. Brownell LL.D.

Transylvania College and College of the Bible
 President R. H. Crossfield Ph.D. LL.D.

Andover Theological Seminary
 The Reverend Daniel Evans D.D. Professor of Christian Theology

Union Theological Seminary, Richmond
 President Walter W. Moore D.D. LL.D.

Auburn Theological Seminary
President George Black Stewart D.D. LL.D.

Colgate University
Dean John V. Vichert

Amherst College
President Alexander Meikeljohn Ph.D.

Hobart College
The Reverend Philemon F. Sturgis

Pittsburgh Theological Seminary
The Reverend D. F. McGill D.D. Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government

The Newton Theological Institution
President George Edwin Horr D.D. LL.D.

Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg
The Reverend Herbert C. Alleman D.D. Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis

Lafayette College
The Reverend Samuel Albert Martin D.D. Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy

Western Reserve University
Mr. Charles Lathrop Pack

The Western Theological Seminary
President James Anderson Kelso Ph.D. D.D.

Pennsylvania College
The Reverend Milton H. Valentine D.D.

Illinois College
The Reverend Thomas W. Smith D.D.

New York University
The Reverend Robert Mackenzie D.D.

Haverford College
Rufus M. Jones Litt.D. Professor of Philosophy

McCormick Theological Seminary
President James G. K. McClure D.D. LL.D.

Hartford Theological Seminary
Dean Melanthon W. Jacobus D.D. LL.D.

Union Theological Seminary, New York
The Reverend William Adams Brown Ph.D. D.D. Professor of Systematic Theology

THE PRINCETON SEMINARY BULLETIN

Queen's University, Kingston
The Reverend William Morgan Professor of Systematic
Theology and Apologetics

University of Michigan
Duane Reed Stuart Ph.D. Professor of Classics in Princeton
University

The University of Wisconsin
The Reverend William Holme Williams Emeritus Professor of
the Semitic Languages and Hellenistic Greek

Rochester Theological Seminary
The Reverend Walter Robert Betteridge D.D. Professor of the
Hebrew Language and Literature

Waynesburg College
President Herbert P. Houghton

Northwestern University
The Reverend Stephen Joseph Herben D.D. Litt.D.

Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Kentucky
The Reverend Edward A. Warren D.D. Librarian

Hope College, Holland, Mich.
The Reverend John G. Fagg D.D.

Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown
The Reverend William Palmer Ladd B.D. Professor of Church History

Lincoln University
President J. B. Rendall D.D.

The Philadelphia Divinity School
The Reverend James Alan Montgomery Ph.D. S.T.D. Professor
of Old Testament Language and Literature

The Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mt. Airy
Dean Henry E. Jacobs D.D. LL.D.

Whitman College
The Reverend John S. Zelie D.D.

Lehigh University
Robert W. Blake A.M. Professor of the Latin Language and Literature

Drew Theological Seminary
President Ezra Squier Tipple D.D. LL.D.

Crozer Theological Seminary
President Milton G. Evans D.D.

Cornell University

Frank A. Fetter Ph.D. LL.D. Professor of Political Economy
in Princeton University

University of Illinois

President Edmund J. James Ph.D. LL.D.

Boston University

Dean William Edwards Huntington Ph.D. D.D. LL.D.

The Bloomfield Theological Seminary

The Reverend F. W. Jackson Professor of the English Language
and Literature

Swarthmore College

Jesse H. Holmes Ph.D. Professor of the History of Religion

Ursinus College

The Reverend Calvin D. Yost A.M. B.D. Librarian
The Reverend George Handy Wailes D.D. Professor of the
Greek Language and Literature

The Northfield Schools

President William Reeve Moody

Coe College

President John A. Marquis D.D. LL.D.

Drake University

The Reverend Peter Ainslie D.D.

Temple University

Dean W. B. Shumway D.D. Professor of Church History

Moody Bible Institute

The Reverend Robert M. Russell D.D. LL.D.

Allahabad University, The Ewing Christian College

Mr. Allen Welsh Dulles A.B.

Pomona College

Dean E. C. Norton D.D.

Mercersburg Academy

President William M. Irvine, Ph.D. LL.D.

Bible Teachers' Training School

President Wilbert W. White, Ph.D. D.D.

Atlanta Theological Seminary

President E. Lyman Hood Ph.D.

The Rice Institute

President Edgar Odell Lovett Ph.D. LL.D.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN THE
LIGHT OF PRESENT DAY
DEMANDS

INAUGURAL ADDRESS*

PRESIDENT J. ROSS STEVENSON, D.D., LL.D.

When the General Assembly founded a Seminary at Princeton it was in recognition of an irresistible demand. The supply of ministers was inadequate, and their training was of an unsatisfactory character. There was needed an institution which would attract a larger number of men to the profession of preaching and which would at the same time give them a more thorough and complete preparation for this work of Christian leadership. For theological education, such men as Archibald Alexander, Ashbel Green, Samuel Miller, Eliphalet Nott and John Romeyn recognized this desideratum,—along with the knowledge of a permanent gospel—the same yesterday, today and forever—there must be the knowledge of a time-spirit which is ever changing and projecting the new occasions which teach new duties. The plan adopted for study and attainments did not fix rigid molds for the manufacture of an unvarying type of minister, but provided for such variations as the views and habits of teachers and the requirements of experience might suggest.

The modern age, which is considered as being altogether unique and which is making radical demands along every line of thought, insists that in theological education there should be a complete readjustment, if not a sweeping revolution.

Much of the criticism passed upon theological seminaries, and much of the demand for change reflects the confusions which characterize the whole field of education. The appeal for service, however, is of a more distinct and compelling character when it comes direct from the Church, whose servant the Seminary is. This institution bears as her official title "The Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A." While her gates are open to students of all Christian churches, and as a matter of fact her service has been of the widest interdenominational character as our Alumni catalogue records, nevertheless by

foundation anchorage, by legal ties and by covenanted obligation this Seminary is bound to heed the demands of the age as interpreted and emphasized by the Presbyterian Church. What are these demands? Four of them may well challenge our attention.

I. The first and most fundamental demand, one that has always been advanced, but is now appealing for clearer recognition, is for trained ministers of *apostolic character*. A short time ago the Board of Missionary Preparation interrogated leaders of the Church out on the field as to courses of study most essential in training for mission service. The reply came back, a course in Spartanics, one in Vitalics, and another in Humanics. This meant that the greatest demand was for men of heroic mold, abounding in spiritual life and well acquainted with the needs and aspirations of their fellow-men. Such traits, however desirable, are not hot-house growths. No theological seminary in a three year course has as yet been able to produce them. They must be traced back to the curriculum of the home, even to the discipline and stamina of preceding generations. However, it is expected, and the expectation is most reasonable, that our seminaries should be of such a character that they will appeal to the strong young men of the Church, enlist them for the work of the ministry and give them that spiritual culture which the Church—which the great Head of the Church—deems essential. This demand may seem very commonplace, and its emphasis entirely superfluous, but it was not so regarded by the founders of this institution who were careful to declare it as an object of primary importance. They also went so far as to delineate the path of duty for professors and students in fostering true experimental religion and unreserved devotedness to God. Because this demand is so primary and self-evident, is doubtless the reason why it has never been fully met by any seminary. I say this not in any uncharitable or censorious spirit, but only to voice the mind of the Church. A special committee appointed by our General Assembly to take into account "a wide-spread dissatisfaction with the methods and results of theological education" reported that one of the weak points in seminary training, while making due allowance for varying conditions and unwarranted criticism, is "Lack of spiritual culture." Not that this is wholly neglected, but it does not hold the place that its import-

*The complete address will appear in the January number of the *Princeton Theological Review*.

ance demands. One chief cause of this weakness is the assumption that the atmosphere of a school of sacred learning is necessarily conducive to spiritual health, and that the handling of the gospel will of itself feed and strengthen the soul. Another cause of this lack of spiritual culture is over-occupation with class-room work and premature ministerial functions. Each department of instruction, groaning under the burden of its indispensability, clamors for the maximum of available time, while the American utilitarian spirit is holding out all sorts of allurements for the pursuit of practical efficiency. Jesus trained His apostles, not in Jerusalem amid the passing throngs where life was most congested and intense, but out in the quiet of the country, by the seashore, on the hillside where there were constant reminders of heaven, of the relation of things seen to the unseen and eternal, and where there was time and opportunity for the appropriation and application of truth in all its bearings and the life of the soul could receive its proper nourishment and equipment for spiritual leadership. Our city friends would doubtless concede to Princeton the advantage of quiet location, the atmosphere of high ideals and a freedom from the bustle and distraction which however conducive to action are not contributory to that concentration of thought and purpose, that studious and prayerful discipline of soul, to that spiritual mastery, exemplified in Christ and His apostles, and which is essential to ministerial preparedness. However, the problem is not so much one of environment as of recognized responsibility. The Assembly report to which I have alluded summons our theological seminaries to foster the spiritual life of the students, that they may become men of vision, of prayer, of reality, men of God, and it places responsibility upon professors, who are not called to be merely teachers to train the mind and to communicate the largest supply of highly specialized knowledge, but who are commissioned as pastors, that with an intimate personal acquaintance with the students, they may deal with the souls committed to their charge, as those who must give account to the great Shepherd of the sheep.

II. The Church is also demanding of our seminaries that they send out men of *large positive faith* and all *aflame with a vital message*. Whether it be in the definitions of

creeds, in the phraseology of our universities, or in the language of the street, the gospel to be preached must be stated in terms of faith and conviction and spiritual reality. The demand for a restatement of the gospel has at least this value: that it requires the minister to make the unchanging message apprehensible to the modern mind. The pulpit dialect and emphasis of fifty or a hundred years ago would not command an intelligent or popular hearing today. A growing preacher cannot be tied down to the verbal repetition of old sermons. Any mature minister who has the fortitude to read through the pulpit discourses to which the people of his first charge were subjected, will have a new revelation of the patience of the saints and of the charity which believeth all things and endureth all things. A ministry for our time signifies a training which will secure the clear and complete apprehension of the saving truths of redemption as contained in the Holy Scriptures, the appropriation of their soul satisfying power, and the ability to press their appeal upon the minds and hearts of present day people in the midst of the intellectual currents and emotional tides which are sweeping them along.

It has been the glory of this institution that she has been thorough and fearless in her scholarship, and has sought to place and to hold men on the one and only foundation—the living Christ—God manifest in the flesh, the power of God unto salvation from sin and endless death by His atoning, expiatory sacrifice, through faith, and has furthermore, endeavored to send out ambassadors who know Christ as their divine Saviour, whose glory is in His cross, and who like the primitive propagators of the faith are ready to hazard their lives for the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

III. The demand for such a ministry accords with a kindred demand, *i.e.*, for a theological education equal to the *social as well as the individual application of the gospel*. This Seminary was called into existence soon after the great awakening of 1800, and her founders for the most part had come under the sweep of that inrushing tide of spiritual life. It was natural, therefore, that they should seek to train a body of men who would be not only lovers and defenders of the truth as it is in Jesus, but “friends of revivals of religion,” to use their own language. This revival spirit

for which the institution has always stood enables us to hear with some degree of distinctness the present day appeal of the Church for an evangelistic ministry, for that preaching of the word which our standards recognize as the effectual means under the power of the Spirit of convincing and converting sinners. When theological education loses its soul-converting power, when it has no message of regeneration and no expectation of definite, immediate supernatural results, it has forfeited all right of maintenance by the Church entrusted with the gospel of the new birth. But the seminary training, which must recognize the primary obligation to give the gospel to every creature, must also contemplate the teaching of all things which Jesus commanded. Individual evangelization, sooner or later, compels social amelioration. In the foreign field a new disciple cannot be wholly Christian while subject to a heathen environment. Mission Boards recognize the necessity of sending out medical, educational, industrial and other agents whose work is largely of a social character. When we recognize this need abroad, we should not hesitate to give it generous consideration at home, and we will not if we are true descendants of John Calvin. We are prone to forget the reforms which that intrepid champion of the gospel brought about in Geneva in the interests of evangelical Christianity. His motive in writing the Institutes was to show that the teachings of the Reformation were not subversive of sound morality and good government. The social significance of the teachings of Jesus, found in his conception of the Kingdom of God, naturally lends itself to the Calvinistic conception of the supremacy of God's will in all departments and relations of life. It is a great mistake to suppose that an institution which still holds to the Reformed Theology has no interest in social problems and no gospel for their solution. I would not for one instant contend that this institution, or in fact any other, is adequately responding to the demand of our day for a more complete and conscientious application of the principles of Jesus. The prevalence of gigantic social evils, lust, intemperance, greed, national vanity and race prejudice, the ghastly tragedy of "civilized warfare," the enthronement of the war spirit, is a lurid commentary on Twentieth Century progress, and an inexorable demand upon the Church to be the "moral guide of society" and

upon the ministry to proclaim the holiness of God, the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and the sacrificial life imposed upon those who claim to appropriate the redemptive issues of Christ's cross.

IV. One more demand which the Church is making upon our theological seminaries is for a ministry that is not only equal to the local needs of city, town or country, but that has a *national and international outlook* and a humanity embracing passion. This demand is accentuated by the judgments of the Lord which are in the earth, by those crises which are determining what the coming civilization is to be if we are to have any at all. Nations have been brought so closely together that their moral and religious differences, as well as their social, economic, and political divergencies are clearly recognized, and the question has become acute, what type of nationality and of character is to dominate mankind? The total inadequacy of a non-Christian culture is being demonstrated in Oriental lands. The failure of a semi-Christian culture is forced upon the world's attention by the gruesome slaughter of men who have a common religious heritage and should be living together as brothers. What power can enable nations to dwell side by side and intermingle as one social family, the strong bearing the infirmities of the weak and all working together in entire good will for the attainment of a common destiny? The religion of Jesus is the only religion which contemplates this international problem, and claims to furnish the ideal, and the power for its realization.

Let us never forget the missionary spirit which founded and built up this institution, specifying as a dominant purpose that it should be "a nursery for missionaries to the heathen and to such as are destitute of the states preaching of the gospel, in which youth may receive that appropriate training which may lay a foundation for their ultimately becoming eminently qualified for missionary work." The first student in the Seminary served the Church as a home missionary, leading that noble succession,—the largest number of missionaries sent out by any institutions in our lands. Of every thirteen graduates, one has been a missionary. Since 1875 one out of every nine has gone into foreign mission service, and in recent classes the proportion has been as high as one out of every four. Of the twenty-four mission

stations of the Presbyterian Church, two thirds of them were founded by Princeton Seminary men. It was a son of Princeton who rallied the forces which brought into being the reorganized missionary life of our Church (Dr. E. P. Swift). He laid down the principle that Church courts are not merely for routine business and for litigation, but for the corporate prosecution of Christ's commission to disciple the nations. It was because of the stirring appeal of another Princeton son (Dr. Jas. W. Alexander), that the General Assembly declared in 1847, "The Presbyterian Church is a missionary society, the object of which is to aid in the conversion of the world, and every member of the Church is a member for life of said society and bound to do all in his power for the accomplishment of this object." This spirit of missions has been quickened by the blood of our martyrs to the glorious company of which there has recently been added another name, a graduate student, massacred in Armenia. I mention this only to say that the missionary spirit of the Church and the demands growing out of it, Princeton has to a large extent encouraged and stimulated, and loyalty to our own sons and heirs compels us, the stewards of a large legacy of missionary interest, achievement and expectation, not only to conserve our apostolic estate, but to enlarge and enrich it, and to do this by making ample provision for the thorough and complete training, according to the highest standards of those who are to engage in missionary service.

The guiding hand of God, which has so signally blessed and used this school of Theology in the years that are gone, would seem to have been conducting her into a realm of power and influence for such a time as this. Here is a unique position of confidence because of a century's faithful service, sending out more than six thousand men to minister in Christ's name—a position of confidence because of a representative directorate and trusteeship, which knows and possesses the mind and spirit of the Church; because of a tried and trusted Faculty,—a united body, not easy to secure in these days of acute theological differences, and yet essential to a harmonious and prosperous stewardship; because of a multitude of Almuni, scattered all over the world, and upon whose cooperation we may depend. These should be gathered into associations at strategic centers in order that the Seminary may be of

service to her sons, and in order that they in turn may help keep their Alma Mater young and vigorous, in touch with living issues. It is commonly supposed that our income is adequate for the financial burdens which the Church would place upon us. But although we may have enough for immediate sustenance, we shall require a great deal more for the proper care of the increased number of students required for the waiting harvest fields of the earth, and for the enlargement of departments which the more highly specialized work of the Church has made a necessity. "I want to live" was the burden of Phillips Brooks' thought shortly before he died, giving as his reason that the next twenty years would offer greater opportunities for the Christian minister than any other like period of history. For any time, but more particularly for the time just before us there can be no higher, nobler, calling than that of leading the forces which are to establish a kingdom of truth and goodwill,—the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ,—which is to rule over all and endure forever. To train these leaders is a task whose grandeur and range engaged the three years' service of the greatest of all Teachers, and today challenges the largest investment of consecrated life for its adequate prosecution. And who is sufficient for these things? Who can lead the leaders of the coming day, so that through them the knowledge of God shall cover the earth and the Kingdom of His truth and love be established. Thanks be unto God, who always leadeth us in triumph in Christ and maketh manifest through us the savor of His knowledge in every place, and to Him is the Kingdom and the power, shall we give glory forever and ever.—Amen.

THE PLACE OF HOMILETICS IN THE TRAINING OF THE MINISTER

INAUGURAL ADDRESS*

PROF. J. RITCHIE SMITH, D.D.

It is with mingled emotions that I assume in this public and formal manner the duties of the office to which I have been called. I am sensible of the honor, I am grateful for the privilege of service, I am mindful of the responsibility. And as I consider the importance of the work, and call to mind the learned

*The complete address will appear in the January number of the *Princeton Theological Review*.

and godly men who have filled and adorned this chair, men whose memory is among the choicest treasures of an institution so rich in memories, I am conscious of my own unworthiness.

I am bound to Princeton by a chain of gracious and sacred associations that stretches back to the days of early youth. I think of my College and Seminary training received in this place; of frequent visits in later years; of the uniform kindness shown me by the authorities of the Seminary; of my classmates and friends, Benjamin B. Warfield and George T. Purves, called to the service of the Seminary, and discharging the duties of their office with conspicuous honor and fidelity; of my sons educated here; of my father, who gave this institution so large a place in his thought, his love, his ministry; of the work of the past year, made easy and delightful by the cordial good will of the governing boards, the faculty, the whole student body; and under the spell of these grateful and inspiring recollections I feel that Princeton to me is home.

The occasion suggests, even prescribes, our theme. The Place of Homiletics in the Training of the Minister. Four years ago my predecessor, Dr. Loetscher, treated a similar theme in his inaugural address—Homiletics as a Theological Discipline; and the field was so ably and thoroughly surveyed that it would be superfluous as well as presumptuous to attempt to trace again the line of thought which was then pursued. I shall essay the simpler and easier task of discussing some of the more obvious and practical aspects of the subject, and indicating the methods of study and training that may be employed.

We shall consider first the nature of Homiletics, then its relation to other branches of theological discipline; and close with a brief study of methods.

I. The nature of Homiletics. It is both a science and an art. Science is primarily concerned with the acquisition of knowledge, art with the use of knowledge. Science is the root of art, art is the fruit of science. No art accomplishes worthy results that is not based upon scientific principles; no science is turned to practical account except through the medium of art. Art is science at work. There are departments of theological study which are purely scientific. Though the end which they are to serve be not forgotten,

they do not provide or even directly contemplate the means by which the end may be attained. They do not undertake to show how the knowledge which they furnish is to be put to service. That is the task of Homiletics.

The actual content of Homiletics as a science, the contribution which it makes to the common stock of knowledge, is meagre. Regarded as a branch of rhetoric, it simply recognizes the laws and principles which regulate all forms of oratory and composition, and applies them to the sermon. Clearness, force and beauty are everywhere to be sought, and always by the use of the same means. There is indeed a marked distinction between the sermon and other forms of public address in two respects: (a) the preacher has a fixed and definite message, which he is not at liberty to alter. He is bound by the terms of his commission. (2) he must seek a definite spiritual end. Both means and end are prescribed. But these differences evidently concern rather the ethical quality than the literary form of the sermon. It is plain that if Homiletics is distinguished from rhetoric, little remains that may be called scientific. Since it draws its material from other sources, indeed, and its form from rhetoric, we might speak of it as a science of method. And here of course we touch, if we do not cross, the borderline between science and art.

Homiletics is related far more intimately and directly to the application than to the acquisition of knowledge. That is to say, it is predominantly an art rather than a science. It teaches men how to use the knowledge that they gather from every quarter. The main elements that enter into preaching are the message, the man, the method. What is the relation of Homiletics to each of them?

(1) It is not the province of Homiletics to convey or impart the message. That is the function of exegesis, of Biblical and Systematic Theology. Homiletics presumes the message. (2) It is the law of the kingdom that God speaks through man. The Word became flesh. The message is given to the man, the man must be prepared to deliver the message. With this preparation the several departments of Practical Theology are immediately concerned, and the professors should sustain a pastoral relation to the students. Homiletics deals not merely with the formal rules of rhetoric, but with methods of study, with modes of life,

with habits and purposes and motives, as these are all involved in the training of the minister for his high calling in Christ Jesus. (3) Beyond the general discipline of mind and heart for the work of the ministry, there is need of special training for the duty of preaching the Word. How may the truth be most clearly and effectively presented? That is the question of method which Homiletics attempts to answer.

II. The Relation of Homiletics to other branches of theological discipline.

It may be said in general, as has been already suggested, that it is the function of Homiletics to show how the truth acquired in other departments of study may be put to service; translated from terms of thought to terms of life; converted into character and conduct. This opens the question of the relation of action to knowledge. There is no room for detailed discussion of so large a theme; we can only indicate the direction in which the discussion might proceed. (a) action is the test of knowledge, defines its boundaries, determines its value. Ideas vague and undefined appear magnificent, as objects loom up large and imposing in the mist. A little water makes a great cloud of steam. A little knowledge swells to vast conceit. The wisest of men in his own esteem is he who has just crossed the threshold of learning. He says in the words of the Psalmist, though for a different reason, I have more understanding than all my teachers. Condense the vapor, apply the knowledge, and its real bulk and utility are seen.

(b) Through action knowledge is mastered, becomes really ours, is made obedient to our will. Knowledge is a tool that we learn to use by using it. Knowledge used is power. We get possession of it by putting it to work. Then it becomes our servant. We learn the general principle by applying it to particular instances. He that will do shall know is the law. It is not knowledge stored up idly in the brain, but knowledge linked to the will, knowledge at the tip of the tongue, at the ends of the fingers, that is really ours. We learn by doing. So Emerson reminds us: "Skill to do comes of doing; knowledge comes by eyes always open, and working hands; and there is no knowledge that is not power."

(c) Through action knowledge is transmuted into character. Knowledge of itself has no ethical quality. But as soon as we begin to use

it, we enter the sphere of relations, motives, purposes, that is, the sphere of morals. One of our Lord's most weighty and pregnant sayings has its application here. "There is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him; but the things which proceed out of the man are those that defile the man." It is not the knowledge that we gain, but the use to which we put it, that honors or defiles.

(d) Through action knowledge is made the minister of God in the service of men. Knowledge alone is barren. Knowledge is fruitful when it is allied to action. It is the uniform and emphatic teaching of Scripture that all gifts and attainments must be measured and valued by their utility, the service which they render to the Kingdom of God. Knowledge for its own sake has no place in the Christian life. Nothing exists for itself. Everything has its relations, its responsibilities. In the Old Testament wisdom is concrete and practical, beginning in the fear of God, and issuing in a godly life. It is knowledge turned to character and conduct, and enlisted in the service of God and man. When our Lord gave his disciples an example of humility and service in the washing of their feet, he said to them: "If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them." Blessedness is nowhere attached to knowledge alone. "To him therefore that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Paul gives the first place among the Christian graces to love, because love is the grace that serves, and therefore wears the likeness of the Master, who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and humbled himself even unto the death of the cross for the redemption of men. Usefulness is the standard by which every gift and grace of Christian character is tested. "Knowledge puffeth up, love buildeth up." Mere knowledge acts upon a man like a pair of bellows, inflating him with self conceit and vanity; makes of him a bag of wind, swollen, empty, useless. Love builds up in himself and in others the temple of a godly character and life.

In harmony with this teaching of the Scripture our Form of Government affirms as one of the first principles of our faith that "truth is in order to goodness." The religion of the Bible is singular among the great religions of the world in making the preaching and teaching of the truth the central feature of its worship, and the main function of its ministry. Religion

is essentially a matter not of form but of faith, not of ritual but of righteousness, not of sacrifice but of service. Under the old covenant priests and prophets were teachers, and in the later years of Jewish history the synagogue was established for the religious instruction of the people. Under the new covenant the preaching of the Word is the duty enjoined by the risen Lord upon his disciples. The more closely the church approaches the New Testament norm, the more highly is the pulpit exalted. The minister is a preacher, not a priest.

If this be true, it determines the answer to a question with which we are profoundly concerned—What is the primary purpose of Seminary training? It is not scholarship, but efficiency in the work of the ministry, the service of the Kingdom of God. To that efficiency scholarship contributes an important element; but it may never be made an end in itself. If truth is in order to goodness, scholarship is in order to service. There are men whose lives are devoted to scholarly pursuits, bounded by the four walls of the study. The church has need of them, and their work is of inestimable value. But they too have before them a higher aim than the mere amassing of knowledge for their own enrichment. They are set for the defense and confirmation of the gospel. They provide munitions of war for those who are engaged upon the field of battle. Their books are arsenals. Though scholarship may be the immediate purpose of their labor, the ultimate purpose is service. For such men abundant provision is made, and every facility is afforded them to pursue their studies.

But great scholars are few. For exceptional men special opportunities are properly furnished. But it is the main function of the Theological Seminary to train the average man for the average pulpit. The great work of the church and of the Kingdom is not done in cloistered retreats, where great scholars, in Milton's phrase, "behold the bright countenance of truth in the quiet and still air of delightful studies"; or in splendid cathedrals, where eloquent orators hold the rapt attention of listening thousands: but in a multitude of humble manses, often scantily furnished with books, and in modest sanctuaries, where men unknown to fame, of ordinary gifts and attainments, break the bread of life to meagre congregations.

In accordance with this principle, this test of utility to which all things must submit and by

which all things are measured, Homiletics undertakes to show how the knowledge gathered from every source, within and without the range of seminary training, may be turned to practical account, may be enlisted in the service of the Kingdom of God.

The knowledge acquired elsewhere is sifted, tested, measured here. The studies of the entire curriculum are passed in review. Though exegesis and theology and church history and apologetics are not directly taught, yet the material which they provide, so far as it appears in the sermon, must be examined with critical care. And as everything that the student has learned may find a place in the pulpit, the professor of Homiletics must be prepared to pass judgment upon it all. The man who holds this chair should not only be a master of the art of preaching, but his studies should cover the whole range of theological science. He cannot of course become an expert in every department, but he should be sufficiently acquainted with all branches of sacred learning to know, in the case of every sermon that is presented, whether the argument is logically developed, whether the illustrations are apt, whether the statements are true, whether the doctrine is Scriptural. He must be prepared to examine, to question, to challenge, to defend at a moment's notice, any position that may be taken by any member of the class on any subject; from the meaning of a Greek or Hebrew word, or the construction of a sentence, to the most profound problem in philosophy or theology. He must be able to distinguish truth from error at a glance. Of the questions that are raised in other classrooms how many are there that may not be sprung upon him? And as there is no department of knowledge, in history science, art, literature, from which the pulpit does not draw its material, the man who is fully equipped for this position should take all knowledge as his province. All that other men teach he is called to examine, to criticise, to approve or condemn. He is the inspector general of the Seminary course. Surely upon no man does the question press more heavily, Who is sufficient for these things? And no man has greater need of the strength and comfort of the assurance that our sufficiency is from God.

It follows again that as it is the province of Homiletics to show how the knowledge gained in all other departments may be put to service,

it unites them in the bond of a common purpose. So numerous and varied are the branches of theological education that there is need of some unifying and coordinating principle that shall reduce them to a single system. The several studies which have a place in the curriculum may seem to be without connection or relation; and each classroom may appear to be conducting a separate and independent work. It is hard for the student to recognize the unity of the Seminary course as he is hurried from one study to another. He is apt to feel that subjects in which he is not particularly interested may safely be neglected while he gives himself to those which are more congenial. It is the office of Homiletics to keep constantly before the mind of the student the common end which all his studies are designed to serve; to point out the place and value of every study in its relation to the lifework of the minister; to show how they may all be used, and used together, in the preaching of the Word. It turns the several streams of theological learning into a common channel. It indicates that the practical aim of every department is precisely the same, and shows how the knowledge acquired in every classroom may be turned to account in the pulpit. The unity of the course is seen when it appears how all departments are knit together in the bond of a common purpose, a purpose to which each contributes an important part. This surely is not the least of the services which Homiletics renders to the training of the minister.

Thus intimately related are the theoretical and practical branches of Seminary instruction. The practical alone would lack substance, material, content; for they deal chiefly with the results obtained in other departments. They depend upon exegesis and theology and all those studies which are scientific in their nature, and are concerned primarily with the investigation of truth. The theoretical alone would lack adequate aim and motive, would remain detached from life, without product or result. Here as everywhere practice alone is blind, theory alone is barren. Theory is the mind that guides, practice is the hand that shapes. The intelligent mind and the skillful hand must work together, and if either fails the task remains undone.

III. Finally we turn to consider the methods that may be employed in the study and practice of Homiletics. They are the familiar

methods which have been tested and approved by long experience. The principles of Homiletics as a science are taught by textbook and lecture, and are immediately reduced to practice. For Homiletics as we have seen is far more an art than a science, and art is essentially the application of the principles of science. Art is not necessarily artificial. It seeks not to fetter nature, but to set it free; not to supplant but to develop. If it is rightly directed, it puts a man in possession of himself, teaches him how to use his powers to the best advantage, with the greatest freedom and effect.

Each class is drilled once a week in the preparation and delivery of sermons. These are criticised by the students as well as by the professor, and the instructor in elocution is invited to pass judgment upon the delivery. There are several points to which criticism is specially directed.

(a) The exposition of the text. Sound exegesis lies at the root of good preaching. The text must be studied minutely, word by word, that its precise meaning may be discovered; then in its historical or doctrinal setting; then in its relation to the whole scheme of Scripture truth. Every fact is part of a great history, every doctrine is part of a great system. No text is thoroughly understood until it has been studied in this three-fold aspect—in itself, in its context, in the place that it holds in the course of revelation. And it must be remembered that every text has an individuality of its own, has its distinctive place and message. To respect that individuality, to suffer the text to speak its own peculiar word, is to secure freshness and variety in preaching, and to adhere to the teaching of the Scripture. There is no pervasion that may not find support in isolated verses of Scripture, detached from the general trend of Bible teaching.

(b) The analysis of the theme. The text furnishes the theme; the theme must be developed. This is often the most laborious part of the preacher's task, to marshal his thoughts in logical order, with cumulative power, so as to drive home a single impression. The clearness, the force, the effect of the sermon depend upon it in immense degree. Are the thoughts of the preacher an orderly array, going on from strength to strength, or a disconnected jumble without unity, system, or proportion? That is a question of vital im-

portance not merely to the artistic or literary quality of the sermon, but to its power of instruction and appeal. All men are sensible of the force of logic, even though they are ignorant of its rules and forms. It is the purpose of analysis to draw out, develop, illustrate the message of the text in the most illuminating, impressive, and convincing way.

(c) The application. It is the task of the preacher to translate the general into the particular, to apply eternal and unchangeable truth to the special needs of his own generation. The word spoken many centuries ago, what message has it for the men of today? In face of the changes that have passed upon the world, political, social, industrial, moral, religious, is the old law still valid? And if it is, how is it related to our modern life? How shall it be interpreted, and how applied to these new conditions that have arisen? For every age in turn the truth has its special accent and emphasis. How enormously extended, for example, is the scope of the Eighth Commandment, when we consider the vast and complicated fabric of modern trade and commerce. New problems emerge. The principle remains the same, but there is created an endless variety of applications unknown before. The chain lengthens, but it holds.

It is evident how wide is the range of topics that may be treated in the pulpit. "The Scriptures principally teach what man is to believe concerning God and what duty God requires of man." Nothing that concerns God or man is foreign to the preacher. He must seize upon those aspects of the truth which the times especially require, and drive them home with all the power he can command.

Attention is called of course to the cultivation of style, which should be vivid, striking, picturesque. Everybody loves pictures. God paints them everywhere, on earth and sea and sky. Jesus taught by parables, and a parable is a picture. The preacher should not be morbidly afraid of sensationalism. There is a true and a false sensationalism. They are distinguished by their motives—one seeks the glory of God, and the other the glory of the preacher; by the means employed—one uses the truth, the other uses anything that may serve its purpose; by their results—one awakens, arouses, convicts, converts; the other arouses a momentary flame of interest that soon dies out in darkness. "By their fruits ye shall know them." The

preacher ought to make a sensation, ought to aim at making a sensation; for it is his mission to turn men from sin to God, to reconstruct society, to turn the world upside down. The prophets were decried and denounced as sensationalists, so was John the Baptist, so was Jesus, so were the apostles. The imminent danger and besetting sin of the pulpit is not sensationalism, but dulness, sheer deadly dulness.

The great end of preaching is held up constantly before the students, which is that men be born again through the Word, and sanctified through the Word. The conversion of sinners and the sanctification of believers, unto the glory of God, that is the purpose of our ministry. And underlying, sustaining, controlling, inspiring all our ministry must be the power and passion of the Cross. "*Whom we preach*"—not a doctrine, a truth, a system, but a Person. It is not the Cross but the Crucified that saves. It is not the word printed or preached, but the Divine Word, incarnate for the sake of men, that is the power of God unto salvation. It is the duty and the joy of the minister to bring men into personal loving fellowship with God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Lifted up upon the Cross of Calvary, lifted up upon the throne of glory, lifted up in the preaching of his disciples, by whom he is openly set forth crucified, he is drawing all men unto himself. To him be all the praise.

CHARGE TO DR. STEVENSON DELIVERED BY

DR. PATTON

My dear Dr. Stevenson: The fact that I preceded you in the office into which you are now being inducted may make it appropriate that the duty of delivering the customary charge to you on this occasion should devolve upon me. But for this fact, it would have seemed more natural for this service to fall to the lot of one of my colleagues in the Board of Directors who is still engaged in the active work of the ministry and who therefore might reasonably be expected to speak more sympathetically and out of a more intimate knowledge respecting the relation of the Seminary to the Church than I can be expected to do. But whatever my shortcomings may be, I claim to be behind none of my colleagues in the warmth with which, in the

name of the Board of Directors, I welcome you to this most important position and in my appreciation of your special qualifications for the office to which you have been so cordially elected.

You come to the duties of this office out of the active work of the pastorate and bring with you the large experience you have gained in two of the most important charges in the Presbyterian Church. You know, therefore, the importance of thorough training for the minister and the use of that training in the weekly ministrations of the sanctuary. You have been and are still a member of some of the most important administrative agencies of our Church. You are therefore exceptionally qualified for bringing the work of the Seminary to the notice of the Church, and the work of the Church to the attention of the Seminary. It is moreover a matter of gratification to us all that the first year of your service as President of the Seminary synchronises with the year of your elevation to the moderatorship of the General Assembly, during which period you are entrusted with the care of all the Churches. But not the least of your qualifications for this position, though I name it last, is the fact that you have yourself been a professor in a theological seminary; that consequently you know the value and the methods of scientific investigation in the several departments of theology and that you are in no danger of allowing a zeal for popularizing the teaching of the Seminary to blind you to the importance of maintaining a high standard of scholarly efficiency in the professorial chairs.

I congratulate you upon the prospect of being associated with a body of men in the Faculty, the Board of Directors and the Board of Trustees with whom it will be a delight to work. I am speaking out of a happy memory of my own association with these men when I promise you that you will find them sympathetic and responsive to your wishes in regard to the plans you may form for the Seminary's interest and that, as far as they can do so without a surrender of their own proper sense of responsibility, they will co-operate with you to the full extent of their ability. I will go so far as to say, and I think I may say it without offense, that, if your experience shall at all resemble mine, there will be times when you will discover that their judgment is better than your own.

I am so confident that my views in regard to

the work of this institution are practically coincident with yours that I shall not put this address in the form of a charge but will the rather allow myself the liberty of speaking frankly in regard to some matters pertaining to the function of the theological seminary in general, and of this Seminary in particular. I shall not attempt to define the duties of the President of this Institution or to indicate how they should be performed. A man called to this office must interpret the duties of the office for himself and shape his method of performing them according to his own conscientious judgment. Were I to enter into the field of suggestion, to which I might be tempted by virtue of my former relation to the Seminary, I might possibly transcend the limits of good taste and unwittingly be even guilty of what might be regarded as an invasion of personal rights. I hope, however, that, without running too great a risk of trespassing on forbidden territory, I may allow myself the privilege of making a few remarks touching some contemporary issues in the sphere of theological instruction; but in doing this I feel that I may count in the main upon your full concurrence.

This Theological Seminary is a training camp for soldiers of the cross. It is also a fortress. I may have occasion to make use of both these metaphors in the course of my remarks, but I have more immediately before my mind the idea that the Seminary is a place for the training of men for the work of the ministry.

There is a tendency just now to put special emphasis upon the practical side of theological instruction, partly because this phase of the minister's training was relatively neglected in former days and partly also, I have no doubt, because the complicated and multifarious duties of the minister of a modern City Church are in such decided contrast with the duties devolving upon ministers belonging to the older generation. That this demand for more practical training should be met there can be no question, but in meeting it, great care should be taken not to lessen the requirements for thorough study of the great departments of theology. Students naturally desire to receive special instruction in regard to the practical work of the pastorate. This to them is their nearest objective. They accordingly wish to know how to organize the various societies that now form a part of a well equipped con-

gregation; how to manage the Sunday School; how to administer the ordinances; how to solemnize marriage and how to bury the dead. Ministers too, who have had to learn these things by experience after entering upon the work of the ministry, sometimes come back to us and ask why they were not taught all these things in the Seminary. Now of course there is room in a theological curriculum for a great deal of sound advice, good counsel and plain, practical directions which students should have, and which I think they may have without encroaching upon the time which should be devoted to the more laborious work of scholarly acquisition. In fact, the less formal such instruction is the more likely is it to be of practical value, but it must be evident that it is only in an imperfect way that this can prepare a young minister for meeting the practical exigencies of his calling. It would be impossible for a professor to anticipate the difficulties which a student will have to meet in the practical work of the ministry. No amount of instruction can supersede the exercise of tact and individual judgment. Experience is the best and, in many cases, the only possible teacher. You cannot teach a child to walk by giving it lectures on walking; and in respect to many a question in the sphere of practical pastoral duty I am inclined to think that the only answer possible is "solvitur ambulando"—unless you happen to own a motor car.

I notice with interest that the attention of the Seminary has recently been turned to the importance of inculcating a better method of Sunday School instruction and one that is suited to the varying degrees of mental development on the part of the pupils. I venture to hope that a rational system may be adopted, if one has not already been devised, which may save the youth of our Church from the exploitations of the pedagogical psychologists. These educational philosophers have already taken possession of the primary school in secular education. They teach children to read, we are told, by the synthetic method of recognizing words in their wholeness as pictures—instead of teaching them by the old analytic method of building them up out of their component sounds and syllables. Perhaps it is to this method that we are indebted for so much original spelling on the part of some of our correspondents, and for the distressing attempts (sometimes, I regret to say,

even by preachers) to go across a familiar polysyllable without falling down. So carefully has the psychology of the child been studied, it would appear, that the precise age when ideas of varying complexity can be mediated to the child's understanding is fully known. And this accurate knowledge of what instruction is fitting to a child, determined as it is altogether by the age of the child and in disregard for all the differing capacities of children, reminds me of those suits of ready-made clothing which we sometimes see in the shop windows, plainly marked 5-6-7-8 years, with correspondingly larger sizes for misses of 12 and boys of 14. How early in a child's life one might venture to impart to him through the parable of the good shepherd a spiritual lesson in respect to his relation to the Saviour I do not know, but I have been told that in using this portion of Scripture for the instruction of children of tender years the lesson of kindness to dumb animals is about as far as it is safe to go.

I am not so foolish as to suppose that a curriculum is something fixed for all time and that no change can be made in it without detriment to the great interests of theological training. I cannot, therefore, confess to a deep interest in the distribution of hours in the several departments of a theological curriculum. Whether one department gets six hours a week and another only five or four is a matter of detail that can best be left with the Faculty, where it properly belongs. But I am deeply interested in maintaining without any loss of efficiency the great and masterful branches of theological encyclopaedia, no matter how urgent the demand may be for the introduction of new subjects of study; and, in spite of the fact that ministers commonly use their Greek and Hebrew less than they ought to use them, I should deprecate any move that would make the study of the Scriptures in the original tongues an optional thing with any student who wishes to receive the diploma of this Seminary.

I recognize the importance of some of the new studies for which the plea is made that they should be made part of a theological curriculum. Great questions in social ethics, for example, are demanding the attention of our ministers and these questions should be dealt with in the theological seminary. Sociology is knocking hard for admission at our doors and, under the right conditions, I think it should be

admitted, but a Sociology of experimentation, of artificial methods of reform and of mere statistical information does not fulfill these conditions. The pathological conditions of society, as they reveal themselves in poverty, disease and crime, deserve the serious consideration of the Church and may well fall within the scope of the Minister's work. But it is not so much the phenomenology of disease that deserves our attention as its etiology and its therapeutics. As to the first question we shall find that the answer is given in the old fashioned doctrine of sin, and whether the answer to the second is to be found in a war against circumstances or in a change of heart will depend upon the conception men have of the meaning of Christianity. I still adhere to the Gospel as the best and only cure for all social ills.

I am in favor of a very generous theological curriculum. The table should be liberally supplied with the delicacies as well as with the substantial meats of theological nourishment, but we must remember that men have varying appetites and, not only so, but varying capacities as well. We therefore cannot expect every student to profit alike by everything that every professor has to say. It is not what you eat but what you digest that does you good. It is only, in my judgment, as a man works his material over for his own use that it becomes part of himself and it is only as it becomes part of himself that he is benefited by it. Just how this process of mental metabolism goes on I do not know, but that is not strange for, if I am correctly informed, even in the material sphere of human physiology metabolism still has its mysteries.

I suppose I am treading on delicate ground when I venture to say a word in regard to professors. As we have already heard in the lesson from the Scriptures, there are in a great house vessels of silver and vessels of gold, vessels of wood and vessels of earth. I suppose we all recognize that some of our friends carry their knowledge in earthen vessels, and we bear with their limitations and hope that they will bear with ours, but if we had our way we would all draw the line at the wooden ones. We professors do not ordinarily criticise one another. We recognize that there may be diversity of gifts as differences of administration. We see in these differences the evidence that a Faculty is an organization made up of human beings and

not a machine. With students, on the other hand, the criticism of professors is a favorite pastime. I would not do too much to discourage it for it gives them pleasure and is, I dare say, profitable withal; for thereby is sometimes revealed an interest in theological study and a zeal for the richer development of a department which otherwise might not have attracted attention. But I think I may say that when a Board of Directors undertakes the work of academic evaluation it enters upon a somewhat difficult task. It is so hard to standardize professorial efficiency. You may for example require a student to commit to memory a hundred lines of poetry every day, when the daily task of writing a hundred lines of poetry might seem unreasonable—the call for quantity endangering the quality of the output. Professors differ: one is a great teacher; another is a great writer; still another is a great scholar; some professors are industriously busy during every waking moment of their lives and some produce the impression that they pass a great deal of their time in idleness. But let us not misjudge the seemingly idle man: incubation is not a process of violent activity and yet in the domain of natural history, under normal conditions, it is followed by very satisfactory results. I remember with reverence my teachers in this Seminary. I cannot say exactly what I learned from them. Much of the good I got came through my admiration of them. I watched them closely. I observed their methods. They gave me ideals. They made me say to myself—"That is the way I should like to do my work"—and, in a humble way, that was how in later years I tried to do it. I thank God that

"rigorous teachers seized my youth,
And purged its faith, and trimm'd its fire,
Show'd me the high, white star of Truth,
There bade me gaze, and there aspire."
There were great professors in this Seminary in those days, and there are great professors in this Seminary now. I am an old man now and it is too late for me to take up a new branch of study, but there are young men in this Faculty who, when I hear them talk upon the subjects to which they are devoting their lives, make me wish that I was young again that I might sit at their feet and take up these studies under their leadership.

There are many forms of professorial efficiency and there is a place in the theological

seminary for different types of men: for men who give inspirational lectures and men who come to close quarters with their students in Socratic dialogue: for men who present truth in appetizing, didactic morsels, and men who steady us by their massive learning and judicial calmness: for men whose words are a clarion call to service and men who delight us with dialectical sword-play.

I hope, therefore, that the standard of the Kindergarten and the primary school will never be made the canon by which we are to judge the master workmen of the academic world.

This Theological Seminary, as I have already said, is also a fortress. By this I mean, of course, that it is committed to the defense of Christianity as a superatural religion. But I have already exceeded the time allotted to me and I can say only a word. When we affirm, however, that we are committed to the defense of a definite theological position we shall be exposed to criticism. "You claim," they will say, "to be searching for truth, but you are really defending a foregone conclusion." But does the defense of a belief necessarily carry with it insincerity in the possession of a belief. Does it necessarily imply a lack of learning or of logic or of honesty on the part of those who hold the belief? I cannot see that it does. I have never heard the learning or the logical power of a great advocate disparaged simply on the ground that he held a brief for a foregone conclusion. I can well understand the position of those who say "We have here no continuing conviction but we seek one to come and we need all our learning and logical power in order that we may find it." Our position, I confess, is somewhat different from this. We are in possession of certain definite convictions which are exposed to hostile attack and we feel that the ripest scholarship and the most searching inquiry can be employed in no better way than in the defense of these convictions. Of course, if it is a fault to believe that Christianity contains a certain definite body of knowledge we admit that we are justly open to criticism, but I do not believe that to be ever learning and never able to come to a knowledge of the truth is a sign of theological supremacy. The greatest issue at the present time is that which deals with supernatural Christianity. The great battlefields of religion are those of

philosophy and history. I know of no more important service that this Seminary can render than the defense of historic Christianity. Could men see this as I see it they would feel, I am sure, that the service which this Seminary has already rendered and that yet remains to be rendered by her Faculty is worth all that the Seminary has cost, even though a student had never darkened her doors. But that Princeton Seminary may do this work, as the men who are in her Faculty would like to have it done, she needs larger endowments. We are in need of the munitions of war and are looking to you, Dr. Stevenson, to do for Princeton what Lloyd George is doing for Great Britain in this regard. Princeton Seminary, in the Providence of God, is called to occupy a conspicuous place of honor in the defense of the faith once delivered to the saint. Will the Church enable her to meet the full measure of her responsibilities and take full advantage of her great opportunity?

May you have a long, happy and successful career, Mr. President, as the head of this institution and, under your guiding hand, may you see this seat of learning with an ever-increasing body of students, an enlarged curriculum and an adequate material equipment so far surpassing the glory of her former days that the friends and foes alike of historic Christianity, as they survey the great centers of theological learning and realize what this institution has done and will continue to do in defense of fundamental truths, may feel constrained to say—"There, there, in Princeton Theological Seminary, is to be seen the Gibraltar of the Christian faith."

THE CHARGE TO PROFESSOR SMITH

by

THE REV. WILLIAM L. MC EWAN, D.D.

It is with sincere pleasure that I undertake to discharge the duty laid upon me by the Board of Directors in connection with your installation into the Chair of Homiletics in this Seminary. With more than the usual and polite meaning of the words I offer you my hearty congratulations. I would at this time do more than felicitate you upon your election, and pray the blessing of Almighty God upon you and your labors in this Seminary. You have been greatly honored in the Church of your fathers.

You have been chosen to the Professorship of an important Chair in this great theological school. You will have the inestimable privilege of intimate comradeship and fellowship with the rare men who constitute the faculty.

The Board of Directors in seeking a successor to the great teachers who have filled the Chair of Homiletics in Princeton Seminary have chosen you because of the distinguished services you have rendered in eminent pulpits, and because of your qualifications to teach the subject of your department. Having heard you during the past summer deliver a truly great course of lectures on the subject of preaching, I am the more competent, as representing the Board of Directors, to congratulate the Seminary on your coming to be a member of its faculty, and to give expression to their high and confident hopes concerning the work you will be able to do. In consummating the election and carrying out the will of the Board of Directors, this inauguration service is now held.

The discipline of Homiletics has always had an honorable place in the curriculum of the Theological Seminary. There is no need to vindicate its rights here, nor to emphasize its proportionate importance, neither would it be fitting for me to enter into a discussion of the relation of Homiletics to Rhetoric nor to discriminate between the importance of regarding it as a science or as an art. The discipline has its recognized and sufficient place in the curriculum of this Seminary, and its usefulness is not questioned by any.

In a peculiar and unique way the Professor of this department comes into an intimate and sympathetic understanding of his students. The revelation that a student makes of his personality, his knowledge, and the method by which his mind works, as he externalizes his inner consciousness in the sermon he produces, is perhaps fuller and more intimate in this department than in any recitations he may make in other class rooms. A man can recite Hebrew or Greek or History or Theology, and give satisfaction to the Professor, without revealing much of himself; but, as he brings his own interpretation of the Word of God in a sermon, he inevitably declares what manner of man he is. This gives to the Professor of Homiletics great assistance in his dealing with individual students.

I desire in the very brief time that ought to

be used by me on this occasion to suggest two or three ideas which, I think, the present conditions in the life and work of the Church make worthy of your consideration.

I would charge you, first, to teach students the supreme dignity and greatness of the office and functions of the ministry. Dr. Loetscher said a very true thing when he wrote "After all, the greatest problem of Homiletics is not the making of the sermon, but the making of the preacher." The distinct preparation of a man for the ministry begins with the call of God to him in his own soul. The minister does not choose preaching as his profession in the same way and from the same motives that other men ordinarily choose their life work. However it comes—whether from an impulse that began at his mother's knee, or from the knowledge of the world's need pressed in upon his soul, or from the gradual crystallization of the vague yearnings of his heart into solemn conviction—ultimately, the man called of God comes to feel "necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me if I preach not the Gospel." In the full, unreserved surrender he makes of his life and the totality of his powers, he is brought into the goodly fellowship of the prophets and apostles and martyrs, and into a new and closer relation with his Savior. Like the true soldier, he awaits his orders as to where and when he will do his work. In the glory and privilege of the high calling, when his eyes have once seen the vision of his ministry as an ambassadorship for Christ, he is ready to face discouragement, hardship, or death if need be, or to live a sober, righteous and Godly life in the midst of an ease-loving and wordly generation.

It is my belief that most students for the ministry come to the Seminary with this high ideal before them. The Professor of Homiletics has a peculiar opportunity and responsibility to keep this ideal undimmed and unfading. It is true that we hear from many quarters the statement that the power of the pulpit is waning and the interest in sermons is dead. God has not only pleased by the foolishness of preaching to save men. He has also made men so that they need and require the preaching of the Gospel. As long as the heart has passions; as long as death breaks the sweetest ties of life and love; as long as the hope of immortal life burns in the human soul; so long will the world have need of men

who have been set apart to a Holy calling, and who are the representatives of God's everlasting righteousness and infinite love.

I charge you, in the second place, that you teach your students the essential elements of a sermon. In the multiplicity of good works and workers, men are losing sight of what a sermon really is. In the feverish activity of the present age, in the appeals and clamors for recognition and appreciation from so many organizations and movements, the Church is being pressed to surrender the sermon from its services—to put in its stead something else, until the very sources of power and benevolence are endangered. An interesting talk on a question of ethics or morals or political righteousness is not a sermon. Neither is an oration, nor a lecture, nor an essay a sermon. A sermon has been defined by Dr. Patton to be "A rhetorical organism evolved by a genetic process from a text of Scripture, and standing in vital and obvious relation to it." It may have the learning and the force and the beauty of other forms of literature or elocution, but it is distinguished from them in that it is drawn from and depends upon a passage of Scripture. It is a structure which is orderly and complete, having a beginning and a middle and an end. Its relation to the Scriptures is vital and essential. Sages and philosophers, even in pagan and heathen countries, can praise the excellence of truth and point to the shining heights of purity and virtue, but only the preacher of the Gospel of Jesus Christ can show the way and the power in which sinful men are to walk to attain these things.

There is an unfailing freshness about the sermon that truly sets forth the thought or the doctrine or the duty which the Holy Spirit meant to teach in that particular text. The serious life work of the preacher is preaching. There is a vital relation between the pulpit and the doctrine of justification by faith. In the Protestant Church the Preacher has no authority nor sanctity except as he proclaims the Word of the Lord. Life is too short, and Death is too near for the minister of the Gospel to fail to preach a sermon as the opportunity is given to him.'

I charge you, in the third place, that you teach your students how to preach the Word of God to sinful men. In order to preach with power they must believe the Word of God. They must preach as if they believed the Word,

and preach so as to lead others to believe and obey. Here every talent and all the strength and time and patience you have, and all the skill that comes from your knowledge of the individual student, will not be too much. It may seem presumptuous for me to make suggestions to you, but I venture to make one that I am assured will meet with your approval. It is, that the students be required to preach as much as possible during their course. The artist must learn technique as well as understand theories.

Finally, I charge you to be true to the New Testament conception of preaching; to be true to your own high ideals of preaching which you have been able to hold and manifest through the years; to be true to the needs of the sinful world; to be true to these young men who have come to this institution for their preparation, whose usefulness on earth, and whose reward in heaven, will depend, in some measure, upon the way you teach them to preach the everlasting Gospel.

PRESIDENT JOHN GRIER HIBBEN,
PH.D., LL.D.

IDEAL COLLEGIATE PREPARATION

I appreciate the honor of representing Princeton University upon this occasion and of bringing to President Stevenson our very hearty felicitations and best wishes for the success of his administration. We are persuaded that by his tact, ability and consecration the highest interests of the Seminary will prosper in his hands. I would also extend the congratulations of the University to Professor J. Ritchie Smith, one of our own sons, a graduate of Princeton, then the College of New Jersey, of the Class of 1872. From his admirable statement this morning of the function and purpose of his chair, I am confident that his courses in the Seminary will prove a veritable clearing house for the various instruction of his colleagues.

Princeton University and the Theological Seminary have many points of likeness, as well as many marked differences. The two institutions have the common task of preparing our young men for the serious task of living and the performance of a worthy work in life. Your young men, President Stevenson, come to you all of them with a special purpose of dedicating their lives to the gospel

ministry. We also endeavor to hold before the minds of our young men the necessity and privilege of giving themselves to some form of ministering service as regards the world in which they are to live and do their work. Whatever may be the particular vocation, we strive to train our students to the end that they may not only pursue a personal career merely, but may make that career a source of good to their fellow-men. Your young men come to you with lives already consecrated. We hope to send our young men out from us after four years with the spirit of consecration in the loyal service of God and the world. Your body of young men is homogeneous as regards their fundamental belief, inasmuch as the Seminary represents one particular denomination of the Christian world. In the University we find among our students all the various creeds of Christendom. A cross section representing the religious conviction of our young men would show every phase of belief which exists to-day throughout the Christian church as a whole. We have found therefore that it is our particular task to cultivate the spirit of tolerance and helpful cooperation in the field of Christian service, and it seems to me that it is this idea which must be emphasized throughout all the Christian churches of to-day. The need of the world, so urgent and so desperate, places upon all of our universities, Theological seminaries, and churches alike, a heavy burden of responsibility, to minimize our differences of opinion and emphasize our common faith and common purpose.

It is with great hesitancy that I feel constrained to express my dissenting opinion as regards the figure which my dear friend, Dr. Patton, has just employed this morning to indicate one of the essential functions of the Seminary, namely,—that it is a “fortress” within whose well guarded walls the defenders of the faith should reside. Modern warfare has proved the futility of the fortress, and the fortress at the present time in the affairs of the Christian world has but one function, namely,—to throw wide its gates in order that those within may advance for a sortie which marks the beginning of an aggressive campaign. Instead of the idea of the fortress I would suggest another term, made current by this European war, namely,—that of “consolidation.” Every advanced position indicating the success of an aggressive drive can be

maintained to-day only by an immediate consolidation of all forces, namely,—the bringing up of the reserves and the drawing closely together of all divisions of the one army corps.

We cannot afford to-day to separate ourselves from those who may differ merely in the theological interpretation of what we all believe. We must recognize our allies both on the extreme right and on the extreme left of the great centre. It is well for us to know who are our enemies and unite in a combined attack upon them. Our enemies in this day of the great world crisis are not those whose difference of opinion can be expressed merely by finely spun metaphysical definitions and distinctions, but our real enemies are the powers of darkness, of organized evil, of injustice, inhumanity, the scorn of God, and hostility to the law and love of Christ. Who are our allies? They are all who have expressed however feebly or inadequately some sense of personal devotion to the great Captain of our faith. The one who is to be a leader to-day in the face of this stupendous world emergency cannot be a mere defender of the faith. Our faith, which alone can minister to the sin and the sorrow of the world, needs no defense, but solely the manifestation of the power of sacrificial love. The light in the heavens to-day needs no defense; the splendor of its shining is the proof of its being.

An Englishman who visited the University recently told the following very striking story: “A British officer in Belgium the year before the war was entertained at dinner by his fellow officers. At the close the customary toast “to the day” was proposed, and then someone at the table suggested that it might be more courteous not to drink the toast because of the visiting Englishman. The English officer, however, at once arose and said that he would willingly drink with them “to the day” if afterwards they would drink with him “to the night,” which must inevitably follow “the day.”

We are now in the midst of this night in which light has been turned into darkness, but we believe that a new day is to follow in which the church of Christ will have before it a new responsibility and a new opportunity of such magnitude the church during the whole range of its history has never before experienced. In that day before us there will extend the long line of an aggressive campaign across

the battlefields of Europe and into Asia, and which will finally girdle the whole earth. Let us, therefore, of every nation and of every tribe, of every creed and ritual, what ere our name or sign, come together in harmonious and united ranks, moving forward toward that ultimate victory which will inaugurate a new era of universal peace and good will among men.

DEAN MELANCTHON W. JACOBUS
D.D., LL.D.

THE IDEAL SEMINARY SCHOLARSHIP

To talk on ideals is, as a general thing, to confess that they do not exist. In fact, we talk about them to help secure them. We do not always succeed in our attempt, but the failure is due more often to the fault of the talk than of the ideal.

I confess that, as far as my knowledge and observation go, ideal scholarship is not existent in the Seminaries. I have not the slightest idea that anything that I can say will alter the situation, but it is a relief to express my mind.

I wish to state, as a general thesis, that a Seminary scholarship that would command itself as ideal depends upon two things on the part of the student: First an appreciation of Christianity; and second, an appreciation of the Bible.

I do not believe there is a Seminary of any standing that does not find its chief task to consist in maintaining among its students at a high level the study of Christianity and its Scriptures, and finds this its chief task because its students, as a general thing, come to it without an appreciation of these things in themselves, and in their bearing upon their work.

What is the reason for this? Let me tell you. The president of a well-known and influential college, I am told, came to one of our large cities and spoke to one of its educational clubs. In the discussion which followed his address he said that he did not consider that a college had anything to do with teaching Christianity. When he was asked for his reason he said, "Because a boy is taught Christianity in the nursery by his parents, and when he gets out of the nursery he is taught Christianity in the Sunday School by his teachers, and when he escapes from the Sun-

day School he is taught Christianity in the church by his minister, and when he goes from the church to his preparatory school he has Christianity grimed into him as one of his studies. Consequently, when he comes to college, he wants to study something worth while."

Unfortunately, with notable exceptions, among which our own Princeton University is a conspicuous example, this opinion is shared by many other presidents. As a result, the presentation of Christianity in its fundamental facts and principles is, generally speaking, ignored in the college curriculum, and as a consequence has no place in the intellectual life of the student body.

The student, therefore, who comes from college to the Seminary—whatever may be his desire to preach Christ or to save men, to proclaim the Gospel across the seas or to reconstruct the social and moral and religious life of his own land, has little or no appreciation of the great historical reality and the great compelling philosophy of his own religion.

If it were true, as it is not, that Christianity had been presented to him in its underlying elements from his boyhood years; and if it were true, as it is not, that the queries and questions, the difficulties and doubts, aroused in his mind by the popular debate on Christianity, the popular criticism of Christianity, and the popular attack on Christianity going on round about him—if it were true that these intellectual troubles of his were met historically and philosophically in his college course, it would still be the task of the Seminary to educate him to the presentation of Christianity to the world. But he would come to this education with an appreciation of Christianity which at present he does not possess, and without which an ideal scholarship in this education is exceedingly difficult for the Seminary to instil in him and exceedingly difficult for him to produce.

But you see to what this leads us. With little or no appreciation of the great historical and philosophical reality of Christianity, he naturally lacks an appreciation of the writings that record its history and express its philosophy. And lacking this appreciation, he has no great interest in their study and investigation. He does not care for the Greek and Hebrew in which they were written, for the

historical circumstances in which they were produced, for the racial and national background that lay behind them and conditioned their origin and colored so the teachings which they contain.

His interest is in Psychology, not in History. He goes to his Bible for sentiment rather than for facts. He absorbs it for a personal experience much more than for a historical or a philosophical conviction, and so he studies it in order to create an atmosphere rather than to construct a foundation for character and life.

And so it comes to pass that, even though he be historically and philosophically inclined, it is the psychology and philosophy of Religion in general, not the historical fact and the philosophical claims of Christianity in particular, to which he devotes his time in preparation for the pastorate; while his missionary education culminates in the study of Comparative Religions, until he knows the history and philosophy of the pagan cults better than he knows the history and philosophy of his own faith; and gives himself to the literary languages of these missionary religions that he may know their Sacred Books at first-hand, while he ignores the languages that alone can give him a first-hand knowledge of his own.

It is evident, therefore, that this failure to appreciate his own religion, in the historical supernaturalness of its fact and the supremely compelling philosophy of its life, leads the student as he comes to the Seminary to a very easy-going study of the Bible. And this tendency I am bound to say is strengthened by the all too superficial study of the Bible in which he has indulged during his college course.

There are some here doubtless whose memory goes back to the days when college study of the Scriptures was compassed in memorizing portions of the Bible. Many more of us remember the succeeding period when the afternoons of Sunday were given to lectures on the Bible and the relations of Christianity to Science and Philosophy. Now the study of the Bible in most colleges is largely in the hands of the students themselves. This study, I am thankful to say, is blessed with a reverent spirit and an evangelistic ideal; but carried on as it is by the students among themselves, it cannot go deep. The life of Jesus, and His ethical teachings, the missionary journeys of Paul and his sociological views, about compass the undergraduate Biblical work. The great

historical reality of the Gospel as a mission and a message which has broken in upon the human world, the great compelling philosophy involved in the problems of sin and redemption which that mission and message came to meet, are seldom if ever laid hold of and faced. So there are men who, when they come to the Seminary and there for the first time face these great problems, for the first time find Christ and themselves. And some there are who, facing in the Seminary these problems for the first time, because of their shallow thinking, lose themselves, and never find Christ. While the greater number, as they failed to appreciate these problems in college, fail even in the Seminary to appreciate them, either for themselves or for those to whom they go.

But distressing as all this is, it assumes an even more disastrous aspect when we realize that as a general thing the undergraduate who has had this surface study of the Bible considers that it is quite enough, and that when he comes to the Seminary it is in the language of the college president, "to study something worth while." And this "something worth while" lies for him, if not in the psychology and philosophy of Religion or in the history and philosophy of the pagan cults, then at least outside the Bible, in what he terms the Practical Department—Psychology, the Labor Problem, Social Politics, Child Psychology, Educational Hygiene, Sunday School Organization, and the Administration of the Institutional Church.

I do not say there is no place for these things in the curriculum of the Seminary. They certainly have their value in the preparation for the ministry. But I do say they are not the things on which the student is to lay the emphasis of his work. And yet, as a matter of fact, it is just these things that fascinate him, it is these things that he appreciates and to these he gives his time and the willing energies of his mind.

I do not wish to create the impression that the ministry has become an ignorant ministry. I do not wish even to suggest that it is uneducated. It is, if anything, educated too much, too broadly, too thinly; not deeply enough, not intensively enough in the things which, as long as Christianity stands before us as the great historical supernatural fact it is, and as the great supremely compelling philosophy of life it is, must constitute the

great things in which the ministry needs to be educated.

The ideal Seminary scholarship begins in the college and the university, with an appreciation of Christianity as a fact of history and a philosophy of life, and an appreciation of the Bible as the record of that fact and the expression of that philosophy. And when it comes to the Seminary it concentrates itself upon that Bible, so that it may thoroughly and completely grasp that fact and compass that philosophy.

I do not need to remind you that we are living in the midst of great and appalling events. The nations of Europe are conscious of eternal realities as they have not been in the generation to which we belong. They are now, and when peace comes they will be still, open to the preaching of Christianity with an intensiveness of its compelling claims such as we might illy attempt in this poor country of ours, which is being blessed with no Pentecost of calamity.

And yet even we here, complacent in our secured peace and ease of wealth, cannot abstract ourselves wholly and completely from the agony of the world. And so even we may come to realize that Christianity is something more than administration and organization, that its claims lie in something deeper than a comparatively good religion, and that those who would preach it to the hungry heart of the world must know it through and through as it has come historically into the world and has confronted man with its commanding and compelling truth of life.

PRESIDENT JAMES G. MCCLURE, D.D., LL.D., was requested to speak on "IDEALS OF PASTORAL FITNESS" and also to bring greetings from sister Seminaries. His address was as follows:

This is a day of sacred pride with McCormick Seminary. Her undergraduates rejoice in knowing that one who formerly sat in the same classrooms in which they today are reciting has been inaugurated President of Princeton Seminary. Her Faculty, with whom Dr. Stevenson was at one time a colleague, send to him their true and tender love. Her Board of Directors, who had the honor years ago of electing Dr. Stevenson to one of her Chairs, expresses to him and to this Seminary sincere congratulations. Her Alumni, scattered all

over the earth, in this land and in foreign lands, unite in assuring Dr. Stevenson that wherever McCormick men are, they pray for his success in the administration of this Seminary.

* * * * *

The ideal type of pastor that our Seminaries should aim to produce is, first of all, that he be *sincere*. None but absolutely true men can meet the needs and satisfy the inquiries of the world's mind. Somehow the entire atmosphere of the Seminary must nourish students in such genuineness that when they go out to live amongst people their words and their spirit shall be so distinctively conformable to one another that they shall be respected as the very embodiments of veracity itself. They are never to preach beyond what they themselves have experienced or desire to experience, nor are they ever to use sentences, however ancient and honorable, that do not represent what they themselves believe. No parrot ever originated a new form of truth applicable to a new age, and no parrot ever satisfied the deepest requirements of a human soul. Our message must be our very own. Our public prayer reveals in a little time what a man actually is, and unless he himself is truth he cannot as an abiding pastor lead men to the truth.

And he must be *magnanimous*. Our Seminary walls must indicate that we acknowledge the working of God's Spirit wherever we see the fruits of the Spirit. A pastor's heart must be large in its sensitiveness to the sorrows and the weaknesses of others, while it is so large that it silently locks within its own walls all the unkindnesses it receives. Only as pastors cooperate and consolidate with other Christian workers can they be such a force in society as is adequate, under God, to cope with the horrors of evil and the heinousness of sin; and no other than a big hearted man can be so generous, forbearing and adaptive to the foibles of his fellows that the work of the Kingdom shall move forward mightily, unimpeded by the hindrances of jealousy, of envy and of irritation.

And the pastor must purpose to *grow*. If our Seminaries give the least impression that our young men have attained to full stature when they leave our walls, those young men will abide in the wilderness and never come to the freedom and expansion and power of the Promised Land. While they are with us we must do everything we possibly can to sug-

gest to students lines of development and usefulness; and then they must go out with a purpose deep as their own being, intellectually, socially, spiritually, to grow and to keep growing so that at thirty-five they shall be more than at thirty, and at fifty more than at thirty-five, and at sixty more than at fifty years of age. No small place, no limitation of health or salary, must stop them in their growth. They can grow, and, under God, they must grow till the days of opportunity on earth are over. A very mustard seed of ability may anticipate tree attainment.

They must also purpose to *wear*. Their tasks and their difficulties must not break them down. If at any time the work of the church as a whole, or the work of their individual church, seems hard, they must keep in mind that the church is in the world for the purpose of conquering what is hard. When the storm breaks upon a vessel, the storm is the captain's opportunity. When a financial crisis threatens, such a crisis is the banker's opportunity. The stress of difficulty is the pastor's opportunity. It is his arena in which he may not alone play the man, but show himself the hero. He is never to lay down his task in any given community because of its burden, but he is to straighten his shoulders all the more because he has a burden, and never to be satisfied until his task has made him a stronger man, and has enabled him to make the community a better community.

Also he must aim to be a *spiritual* leader. The management of "things" must not enslave him. A pastor never answers to his special calling until he becomes a man of God, recognized by his people as one who walks with God, and brings messages from God to them, and can take them into the very presence of God. The one great need of our world is God, and it is the highest honor of the Christian pastor that a man in himself and through himself can so bring God to the human heart that its cry for fellowship with the Everlasting One may be answered and satisfied. No success in benevolences, in additions to church rolls, in recognition in the general community, is ever to be considered sufficient if the pastor fails to make men see in him and see through him the God who alone can meet the requirements of the human soul.

* * * * *

On behalf of all the seminaries of our

Church, I now bring greeting to you, President Stevenson, and to Princeton Seminary. Each of our seminaries is doing its own beautiful and splendid work in its own way. Individuality must characterize us, else we cannot be true to our distinctive missions. We must vary in the emphases and in the proportions in which we state the same Truths. But we are all one in our loyalty to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and we are all one in bringing to this occasion admiration for this Seminary and desire for its progress. And we extend to you from loving hearts, President Stevenson, our assurances of belief in your power to lead; and we pray to God that you may be attended at every step of your onward way with wisdom, courage, love and strength from the God and Father of us all.

REV. SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, D.D.

IDEALS OF MISSIONARY PREPARATION

All down the middle ages, and since the earliest history of the Christian church, men like Raymond Lull, Alexander Duff, Adoniram Judson and a host of others, are examples of how theological training is used by and in foreign missionary service; and today the call for men of theological training is unprecedented both as regards quantity and quality. In the first place there is as insistent and a persistent and an ever increasing call to this seminary, and to every evangelical seminary in our land, for an ever larger number of men of theological training. First, because the larger proportion of missionaries must be preachers. We need our specialists, physicians, doctors, trained nurses, men of science, men of philosophy for our colleges and universities; but the rank and file of the missionary body, now and henceforth until this old world is evangelized will always be composed of preachers, and theologians, who have a message and know how to bring it to the non-Christian world. We need a vastly larger number of these trained men, secondly, because God has opened the doors of access to the nations. They are nailed open. Nine-tenths of the whole world is absolutely accessible to the preacher of the gospel today; and the only reason why the foreign missionary enterprise is delayed is because there is a lack of consecration of life in our seminaries. The proportions read to us this morning by Dr. Stevenson are grand

because we compare Princeton with other seminaries, but if we compare Princeton with the recruiting going on in the universities of Europe in the war of the kings, then I say the recruiting for the war of the King of Kings is despicable. We need men of the type of William Borden of this Seminary, who thought the challenge of the closed door is to be greater than the challenge of the open door. "Knock and it shall be opened unto you," and you cannot knock until you are present at the door.

There is a great call for men of theological training as regards quality. This for three reasons. First, because the work demanded of them is so increasingly severe on all theological lines. To mention the names of one or two missionaries known to most of us will make this clear. Think of the work of Dr. Hoskins, or of Dr. vanDyke. Think of the training needed to prepare works on apologetics. Think of men like Griswold in India. I would like to mention Dr. Rause of the Baptist Church, one of the greatest theologians in Bengal and who, as a mere byproduct of a busy missionary life, prepared twenty-four apologetic tracts for Mohammedans. His work was among the Hindus and Bengalis. And yet those twenty-four tracts are being used in no less than eight languages in the Mohammedan world. Think of the need of preparation for men who are to be the leaders of the native church, men who are to be what Dr. Stevenson showed us this morning, the vital power of religion. "Who follows in his train?" Who does on the foreign field? Who dares to follow in his train in Armenia unless he "can drink his cup of woe, triumphant over pain." "Who patient bears His cross below, He follows in His train." The man who indulges his appetites, who looks for an easy place, for a high salary, for position and prominence, is not the man to lead the native church to martyrdom.

Secondly, we need men of the highest theological training because of the isolation of missionaries. If your medical man sent out to Siam or Burma needs a full medical course, and two years of hospital training besides, what sort of training does your theologian need who is all alone, five hundred miles possibly, from the next mission station. I thank Princeton Seminary for its *Princeton Theological Review*. It was in a book review in the back of that magazine that I got the in-

formation necessary to meet the argument of a learned Mohammedan. If I had not read the review of the book I would have been stumped by his argument. We need men who are thoroughly trained in matters of theology to meet difficult situations in isolated fields.

Lastly, we need men of theological training, in the foreign field, because of the entirely changed attitude of the non-Christian religions. This seminary is not "a fortress." God forbid. This seminary is not a fortress *only*. It is a Plymouth, a West Point. Here we need to have trained the forces that will move out against the whole non-Christian world. We need men who will grapple with all the new sects and philosophies that are hurling themselves against the Christian faith and are challenging all the doctrines of Christianity. Such questions as the truth of the incarnation, the virgin birth, the necessity of the atonement, the resurrection, the death of Jesus, the integrity of the Scriptures; all these are the meat and drink of Mohammedan controversialists, and unless we have met the issues we will not be able to contend against such opponents. Then, I would conclude by making a direct appeal in the line of what Dr. Stevenson said to us in the church, that this seminary should stand more and more for the production of an increased number of men who are ready to lay down their lives to carry the gospel of Jesus Christ to the uttermost part of the earth. Let us have done with singing "Hold the Fort for I am Coming," Let us sing that other grand old song "Onward Christian Soldiers, Marching as to War, With the Cross of Jesus, Going on before."

PRESIDENT WALTER W. MOORE
D.D., LL.D.

IDEAL MINISTERIAL CHARACTER and the place it should have in the mind of any theological seminary.

In the Scripture that was read at the Inauguration Service this morning the apostle Paul says to Timothy: "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses"—that is the essentials of the Christian faith publicly committed to Timothy's trust as a minister—"the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." In these words he states the two fundamental qualifications of ministers of the Gospel: character

and capacity. They must be men of character, Christian character, trustworthy men, or, to use his own word, "faithful" men; and they must be men of capacity, "able to teach others also," as he expresses it—that is, they must be men of the requisite intellectual force and training to instruct their fellow men. As to the second of the qualifications involved in this Pauline conception of the ministerial office, viz. capacity and a broad and thorough training, I think we may say with confidence that the modern church has faithfully endeavored to meet the need, through the organization and work of her theological seminaries. These institutions have their various departments of Exegetical Theology, showing how Christianity came to be, and giving the candidate a first hand knowledge of the Christian rule of faith and practice; and Historical Theology, showing what Christianity has done in the world and how it has done it; and Systematic Theology, showing what the general system of Christian truth is as a logical whole; and Practical Theology, showing how to utilize the truth for the accomplishment of the church's two great ends, self-propagation and self-edification, evangelistic work and pastoral work, ingathering and upbuilding. "Christian theology is the science of the Christian religion, as revealed in the Bible, developed in history, and believed and practiced in the Church," and since the minister is the official exponent of this religion, he must of course master this science in its four great categories. This we have clearly seen and fully provided for in our seminaries. But more fundamental and decisive than all other branches of theology in the preparation of the minister—vastly more important than exegetical theology and historical theology and systematic theology and practical theology, is what we may call *experimental* theology—that personal experience of God by which a man receives into himself the divine message and makes it a part of his life. Only as the truth is vitalized in a man's own heart does it come with living power to other hearts. Abstract truth is unavailing. It is incarnate truth that does the work. Therefore the most important business of a theological seminary is not intellectual equipment but spiritual culture. Above all other qualifications we place character and piety. The apostle who in the passage cited at the outset put character before capacity in

describing ministers as "faithful men, able to teach others also," followed the same order when he said elsewhere—"Take heed to thyself and to the doctrine." The two are inseparably connected. What a man does depends upon what he is. In no other calling does the personality count for so much as in the ministry. Therefore when we ask what place Ideal Ministerial Character should have in the mind of any seminary, the answer is obvious—it should have the foremost place, it should have the place of pre-eminence, it is the paramount concern.

This ideal ministerial Character can be realized in any measure only by *companionship with Christ*. It was so in the first Christian seminary, for of it we read that Our Lord "appointed twelve, that they might be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach." In the same way the Church still seeks to prepare her preachers. To the view of a spiritual church a theological seminary is above all else a place of growth in ministerial character by companionship with Christ. As one of my colleagues in Virginia has expressed it, "She covets for her sons who are to be sent forth to preach at least three years of quiet life, detached as far as possible from worldly cares and avocations, spent in a place where Christ's presence abides in unusual measure and power, and occupied with the study of His truth, and in closest communion with the Lord Himself." In order to make this possible, the Church creates her seminaries. A spot of ground is chosen, sufficiently retired to encourage study, yet not so far from the life of men as to make its atmosphere monastic. Here she erects her buildings and lays out her grounds, avoiding extravagance and luxury but seeking refinement and modest elegance, desiring to imbue the whole institution with the educative power of order, beauty and "whatsoever things are lovely." As the years go by, the place becomes fragrant with a multitude of hallowed associations which utter their appeal to all the sensitive and high-minded young men who tarry within its precincts. The men who teach are chosen from the Church at large with care and prayer, and finally the school is laid upon the heart of the whole Church to be borne aloft to the throne of grace in constant intercessions. To this place the sons of the Church are gathered who look forward to the ministry of the Gospel; and

having brought them here, she commends them to God and the Word of His grace, which is able to build them up. Here she trusts that they will dwell with Jesus till he sends them forth to preach."

In no other way than by some such companionship with Him can they ever illustrate in any degree His ideal of the ministerial Character.

Mr. Chairman, it was my hope to try to sketch this ideal in some of its details and to point out some of the dangers which in this feverish age threaten to rob the ministerial character of its depth and power. The time limit imposed on these addresses rendered that impracticable, and so I decided to speak only of the place assigned by the apostle and by Our Lord to the character of the minister as distinguished from his talents and attainments, as indicating the pre-eminent place that this ideal of character should occupy in the thought and work of our seminaries and the means by which the Church hopes that this ideal will be realized, viz: Companionship with Christ. But a word in closing as to three or four of the characteristics of the ideal minister may not be amiss, and that word is taken from John Bunyan:

"Now there were on the tops of these mountains shepherds feeding their flocks, and they stood by the highway side. The pilgrims therefore went up to them, and leaning on their staves, they asked, 'Whose delectable mountains are these? And whose be the sheep that feed upon them?'

"These mountains,' said the shepherds 'are Immanuel's Land, and they are within sight of His city, and the sheep are His, and He laid down His life for them.'

"Is this the way to the Celestial City?"

"You are just in the way."

"Is there in this place any relief for pilgrims that are weary and faint in the way?"

"Yes: the Lord of these mountains hath given us a charge: not to be forgetful to entertain strangers: therefore the good of the place is even before you."

"Now the names of the shepherds were Knowledge and Experience, and Watchful and Sincere."

Dr. Stevenson, in bringing to Princeton the greetings of Union Seminary on this auspicious occasion, the best thing I can wish for you is that under your administration that Puri-

tan ideal of the ministerial character may be realized in all the young men of whom you are to be pastor in chief, and that year after year, in the persons of your graduates, those shepherds of the Delectable Mountains, Knowledge and Experience and Watchful and Sincere, may go from these halls to bless the Church and the world in a Christlike ministry.

THE PRINCETON CONFERENCE

It was only two years ago that this conference was started by a group of young people in Philadelphia, who a short time before had come to a deeper experience in their Christian lives. Cooperating with them in the movement was Mr. Trumbull, Editor of the Sunday School Times. About seventy-five delegates attended the first conference which was held in 1913 at Oxford, Pa. The next year the Trustees of Princeton Seminary allowed the conference to use the buildings and other facilities of the Seminary. Last year about one hundred and fifty persons met for the conference. This year there was an enrollment of about three hundred, two-thirds of whom stayed for a week or more of the conference session. The notable change in the personnel of the conference was in the wide representation from various parts of the country. Delegates were present from Florida, Texas, Minnesota, Nebraska and Canada. Most of these delegates from distant points had learned of the conference through the columns of the Sunday School Times, which had presented to its hundred thousand readers a report of the helpfulness of the previous conferences.

The general plan was that of the preceding years. Each day began with a Bible period, led during the first four days by Mr. S. D. Gordon, and for the last four days by the Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D. For the second morning period the Conference divided into a number of groups for Bible study. Mission study classes were conducted by representatives from the foreign field. Classes for personal workers were conducted by Mr. S. W. Foster and H. J. Baldwin. The largest of the groups was for the study of problems connected with Christian experience. This class was led by Mr. Charles G. Trumbull. Each evening two meetings were held, one, a vesper service, which was held out-of-doors and allowed opportunity for personal testimonies, and

the other the regular evening platform service, which was devoted usually to an inspirational address. The two great thoughts manifested by the conference were the need of the individual and the need of the world, and the sufficiency of Christ to meet both these needs. The motto of the conference was: "To me to live is Christ." Phil. 1:21. The closing days of the conference were marked by a very special call to service in mission lands. Through Dr. Charles Scott, Mr. J. Campbell White and others, the need of these distant fields was vividly presented. Many of the young people who were delegates to the conference expressed themselves for the first time as ready to enlist for this special service if God should open the way before them. A number of these candidates have already begun their preparation. Some have sent their applications for appointment to the missionary Boards, and one is planning to sail for China within a few months. As has been the case in other years, the influence of the conference is continuing to be manifested in many ways, and it is expected that a far greater number will enjoy the privileges which the conference affords when the next session opens in Princeton for the week of July 15-23, 1916.

THE SUMMER SCHOOL

The third session of the Princeton Summer School of Theology was opened on May 31 and continued through Friday morning, June 11. The opening lecture was delivered by the Rev. Francis L. Patton, D.D., LL.D., on Monday evening. The subject was "The Philosophical Pre-suppositions of Christianity." This was the first lecture of the course delivered by Dr. Patton on the successive evenings of the week. The subjects of the remaining lectures were as follows: "The Historical Data of Christianity," "The Redemptive Aim of Christianity," "The Apologetic Basis of Christianity," "The Fundamental Concepts of Christianity."

The first period on Tuesday morning was occupied by Prof. Geerhardus Vos, Ph.D., D.D., who spoke at this hour dur-

ing each of the days of the week, on the subject of "Some Biblico-Theological Aspects of the Epistle to the Hebrews."

The second period of each morning was occupied by the Rev. Prof. William Brenton Greene, Jr., D.D., who delivered a course of lectures on the general subject of "Christianity and the War." The titles of the individual lectures were as follows: "The Crisis of Christianity as Indicated by the War," "The Influence of Christianity on War," "The Christian Doctrine of War," "The Reasonableness of the Doctrine of Vicarious Atonement," "The Eschatological Outlook of Christianity."

The third period of each morning was occupied by the Rev. A. W. Halsey, D.D., who conducted a series of practical discussions on the "Relations of the Work of the Pastor to Foreign Missions." The lectures of the second week began on Monday morning, at 11:30, when the Rev. William B. Sheddan, Ph.B., spoke on the subject of "The Country Church." On Tuesday and Wednesday at this same hour, President Stevenson discussed "The Problems of the City Church," and "The Church and Social Questions." On Thursday, this period of the morning was occupied by Prof. J. Ritchie Smith, D.D., who spoke on the subject of "Preaching Christ."

On Monday evening, Prof. William H. Johnson, Ph.D., D.D., of Lincoln University, began a series of lectures which continued on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday evenings. Prof. Johnson discussed "Christianity and Modern Thought." The subjects of these lectures were as follows: "The Importance of Christ in Modern Thought," "Christian Experience and Modern Thought," "The Conception of God in Modern Thought," "The Four Gospels and Modern Thought."

On Tuesday morning, Prof. John D. Davis, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., began a series of lectures which continued on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday at the same hour, the subject being "Studies in Leviticus."

At ten o'clock on Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday mornings of the second week, Prof. Frederick W. Loetscher, Ph.D., D.D., spoke on the subject of "John Huss and the Church of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries."

While the attendance upon the sessions of the school was not large, the interest was sustained. Many expressions of appreciation were made by those in attendance. It is expected that an attractive schedule of lectures will be offered for next year, when the sessions of the school will probably be held during the first two weeks of June.

ELECTION OF DR. McDOWELL

It will be gratifying to the alumni and other friends of Princeton Seminary to learn that the Rev. John McDowell, D.D., was elected as a member of the Board of Trustees at the last meeting held in the early summer. Dr. McDowell, who for many years served as pastor of the Park Church of Newark, has recently been called to the pastorate of the Brown Memorial Church, of Baltimore, to succeed President J. Ross Stevenson. He is a Princeton man and deeply concerned in all the interests of the Seminary.

THE OPENING OF THE SEMINARY

The 104th session of the Seminary was opened by special exercises in Miller Chapel on Friday morning, September 17, at 11 o'clock. President J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., LL.D., presided and extended a welcome to the student body, particularly addressing those who were

coming to Princeton to begin their course of study. Prayer was offered by the Rev. Prof. J. Ritchie Smith, D.D. The address of the morning was delivered by the Rev. Prof. Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D., on the subject of "Redeemer and Redemption."

NEW STUDENTS AND ENROLLMENT

The Seminary has had the pleasure of enrolling ninety-four students who were not in the Seminary last year. The newly enrolled students are as follows:

FELLOWS AND GRADUATE STUDENTS

- Luther Moore Bicknell, Trenton Junction, N. J., Park College, 1910; Princeton Seminary, 1913.
- Howard Edgar Bodder, Norristown, Pa., Ursinus College, 1900; Ursinus School of Theology, 1903.
- Frank Goess Bossert, Mt. Joy, Pa., University of Pa., 1900; Princeton Seminary, 1903.
- William Robertson deVilliers, Hopetown, South Africa, Victoria College, South Africa, 1908; Stellenbosch Seminary, 1915.
- Richard John Dosker, Louisville, Ky., Centre College, 1912; Presbyterian Seminary, Louisville, 1915.
- Warren Elsing, Cranbury, N. J., Princeton University, 1908; Princeton Seminary, 1912.
- Charles Darby Fulton, Kobe, Japan, Presbyterian College of South Carolina, 1911, Columbia Seminary, 1915.
- Joel Russel Gaar, Philadelphia, Pa., Westminster College, Tex., 1901; Westminster Seminary, Md., 1904.
- Jan Hendrik Jacobus Greyvenstein, Rhodes, South Africa, Victoria College, South Africa; Stellenbosch Seminary, 1913.
- Elmer Alexander Henderson, Lake Mills, Iowa, Luther College; Luther Seminary, St. Paul, 1915.
- Owen Grove King, Fostoria, Ohio, Heidelberg University, 1905, Central Seminary, Dayton, 1909.
- James Alexander MacKean, Musquodoboit Harbor, N. S., Canada, Dalhousie University, 1905; Presbyterian Theological College, Halifax, 1905.
- Otto August Mikkelsen, Brooklyn, N. Y., Wagner College, 1912; Mt. Airy Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia, 1915.
- Winfield S. Morrow, Wooster, Ohio, Geneva

- College, 1886; McCormick Theological Seminary, 1890.
- Elbert Jerome Nickerson, St. Joseph, Mo., Coe College, 1908; Omaha Seminary, 1913.
- John Gezon Noordewier, New London, Pa., University of Michigan, 1899; Princeton Seminary, 1903.
- Charles Brown Roach, Trenton, N. J., Mt. Union College, Ohio, 1909; Drew Seminary, 1912.
- David Charles Ross, Stewiacke, N. S., Canada, Dalhousie College, Halifax, 1900; Presbyterian Theological College, Halifax, 1900.
- Henry John Ruys, Prairie View, Kan., Calvin College, 1911; Christian Reformed Seminary, 1915.
- Bart Donnelly Stephens, Kenbridge, Va., Alabama Polytechnic Inst., 1909; Theological Department, Vanderbilt University, 1912.
- Homer White Taylor, Parkesburg, Pa., Princeton University, 1900; Princeton Seminary, 1903.
- Frederic Karl Vogt, Watertown, N. Y., Wagner College, 1911; Princeton University, 1915; Mt. Airy Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia, 1914.
- Hsing Linn Yee, Tsinanfoo, Shantung, China, Tengchow College, 1904; Theological Seminary of Shantung University, 1914.
- SENIORS**
- John Randolph Campbell, Stony Brook, L. I., N. Y., Syracuse University, 1912.
- William Thomson Hanzsche, Baltimore, Md., Washington and Lee University, 1913.
- Aladar Tomcsanyi, Homestead, Pa., Heidelberg University, 1913.
- MIDDLERS**
- George Anthony Avery, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa., University of Pennsylvania, 1913.
- Robert Stockton Axtell, Homestead, Pa., College of Wooster, 1914.
- Harold Harvey Baldwin, Milnor, N. D., Macalester College, 1914.
- Frederick Warner Brown, Chicago Junction, Ohio, Heidelberg University, 1914.
- Alva Lee Cloyd, Salisbury, Mo., University of Missouri, 1914.
- David Finis Gaston, Jr., Gastonburg, Ala., Maryville College.
- Tobey Rutei Hosoi, Kamakura, Japan, Heidelberg University.
- Andrew Irshay, Budapest, Hungary.
- Irvin Sturges Shultz, Watsontown, Pa., Grove City College, 1913.
- JUNIORS**
- Howard Elmer Anderson, Stanley, Iowa, University of Iowa, 1911.
- Reuben Walter Anderson, Madera, Cal., Bible Institute of Los Angeles.
- Charles Arner, Allentown, Pa., Albright College, 1913.
- James Franklin Arneal, Redding, Iowa, Cooper College, 1915.
- Anise Elias Atiyeh, Homs, Syria, Maryville College, 1915.
- Donald Grey Barnhouse, Watsonville, Cal., Bible Institute of Los Angeles.
- Linius Ephrum Brown, Vestal, N. Y., Park College, 1915.
- John Russell Bucher, Camp Hill, Pa., Findlay College, 1913.
- Harry Oswald Bush, Philadelphia, Pa., Maryville College, 1915.
- James Cannon, III, Blackstone, Va., Trinity College, N. C., 1914.
- William James Gordon Carruthers, Arlington, N. J., Ohio Northern, 1915.
- Patrick Henry Carmichael, Goodwater, Ala., University of Alabama, 1915.
- David Rhea Coffman, Scotland, Pa., Lafayette College, 1915.
- Anton Hodenpyl Condict, Columbus, Ohio, Cornell University.
- Burleigh Edmund Cruikshank, W. Somerville, Mass., Washington and Jefferson, 1915.
- Roy Lee Davis, Monticello, Ark., Erskine College, 1915.
- Charles Frederick Deininger, Newark, N. J., Ursinus College, 1915.
- Leroy Young Dillener, Cameron, Mo., Park College, 1915.
- Albert Gallatin Edwards, St. Louis, Mo., Yale University, 1915.
- Stanley Richards Evans, Moosic, Pa., Grove City College, 1915.
- Wilbur Chapman Hallenbeck, San Diego, Cal., Occidental College, 1915.
- Harry Eugene Hardy, Los Angeles, Cal., Bible Institute of Los Angeles, 1914.
- Harold Hayes Henderson, Seattle, Wash., University of Washington, 1915.
- Charles Henry Holzinger, Annville, Pa., Lebanon Valley College.
- George Garrison Horn, Prospect, Ohio, College of Wooster, 1914.
- Joseph Hydanus, Randolph, Wis., Moody Bible Institute.

- William Harrison Johnston, Philadelphia, Pa., Lafayette, 1915.
- Clarence Albert Kircher, Ellsworth, Kan., Emporia College, 1915.
- Lewis Herbert Knight, Tulsa, Okla., Kendall College, 1914.
- Richard Lee Kortkamp, Hillsboro, Ill., Washington University, Mo.
- George Bowers Lewis, Wilmington, Del., Macalester College.
- Ward W. Long, Spencerville, Ohio, Taylor University, 1915.
- Thomas Bowman Lyter, Harrisburg, Pa., Lebanon Valley College, 1914.
- Joseph McNeill, Germantown, Pa., Haverford College, 1915.
- Trevor Popkin Mordecai, Cwm Mon., South Wales, Pontypridd College, Wales.
- Russell Paynter, Nassau, Del., Delaware College, 1915.
- Stewart MacMaster Robinson, Philadelphia, Pa., Princeton University, 1915.
- Howard Rodgers, Pittsburgh, Pa., Grove City College, 1915.
- Ludwig Conrad Schaumburg, Viederzwehren bei Cassel, Germany, Moody Bible Institute.
- John William Sexton, Gateshead-on-Tyne, England, Park College, Mo.
- Reuben Welty Shrum, Irwin, Pa., Bucknell University, 1908.
- Daniel Lester Snyder, Levels, W. Va., Randolph-Macon College, 1915.
- Austin Soper, Emporia, Kan., College of Emporia.
- Herbert Johnson Strickler, Newton, Kan., College of Emporia, 1915.
- Theodore Strong, New Brunswick, N. J., Yale University, 1914.
- James Woodruff Teener, Cumberland, Ohio, Muskingum College, 1915.
- George Tester, Toronto, Canada, Toronto Bible College.
- Paul DeWitt Twinem, Wooster, Ohio, College of Wooster, 1915.
- De Forest Wade, Greenwood, S. C., Erskine College, 1914.
- John Franklin Weaver, Princeton, N. J., Waynesburg College, 1915.
- Arthur Jennings White, West Collingswood, N. J., University of Pa., 1911.
- PARTIAL
- Charles George Eric Chilton, Swindon, England.
- Richard Hugh Evans, Delta, Pa., Atlanta Theological Seminary.
- Edward Gillis, Beaumont, Cal., University of Cal., 1914.
- Mary Stewart Harney, Lexington, Ky.
- Kwang Ching Liu, Tientsin, China, Peking University, 1898.
- Leighton Gaines McMillan, Stockton, Ala., Princeton University, 1910.
- David Jonathan Nichols, Stony Brook, N. Y., Moody Bible Institute, 1915.
- Hurn Joo Song, Seoul, Korea, Roanoke College, 1914.
- Neinzio Vecere, Trenton, N. J., Seminario Arcivescovile, Benevento, Italy.
- Joseph Raymond Waite, Warriors Mark, Pa., Princeton University, 1910.

These give their residences as follows:

Alabama	3
Arkansas	1
California	5
Canada	3
China	2
Delaware	2
England	2
Germany	1
Hungary	1
Illinois	1
Iowa	3
Japan	2
Kansas	4
Kentucky	1
Korea	1
Maryland	1
Massachusetts	1
Michigan	1
Missouri	4
New Jersey	9
New York	4
North Dakota	1
Ohio	8
Oklahoma	1
Pennsylvania	21
South Africa	2
South Wales	1
South Carolina	1
Syria	1
Virginia	2
Washington	1
West Virginia	1
Wisconsin	1

The Total Enrollment is as follows:

Fellows	5
Graduate Students	33
Seniors	38
Middlers	42
Juniors	51
Partials	16
 Total	 185

THE MODERATORSHIP

It was an occasion of great gratification to the alumni and other friends of the Seminary to learn that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, at its session in Rochester last May, elected as Moderator, the Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., LL.D., now President of Princeton Seminary. Dr. Stevenson served the Assembly with great credit and is busily engaged during the present year in fulfilling the many duties now associated with the office of Moderator.

THE ELECTION OF DR. HODGE

At the fall meeting of the Board of Trustees Dr. Caspar Wistar Hodge was elected to the Chair of Dogmatic Theology in Princeton Seminary. Dr. Hodge was born in Princeton, September 22, 1870, was graduated by Princeton University in 1892. After studying at Heidelberg University and in the University of Berlin, he was appointed instructor in Philosophy in Princeton University, where he served during the years 1895-97. During the year 1897-98 he served as associate professor of Ethics in Lafayette College. He subsequently served as instructor in Dogmatic Theology in Princeton Seminary from 1901-1907. In 1902 he was ordained to the Presbyterian ministry by the Presbytery of New Brunswick. In 1907 he was installed as Assistant Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in Princeton Seminary, which position he was occupying at the time of his election.

THE SEMINARY AND THE WAR

The Seminary has paid its toll to the European war. The Rev. James A. Beattie of the class of '89, was returning on the Lusitania with his wife to their work in India, when that vessel was sunk off the coast of Ireland by the Germans. Mr. Beattie was lost, but his wife was rescued. Another Lusitania victim was Mr. Indu P. Bannerji, who had finished one year in the Seminary as a partial student, and was going back to his home in India on that ship. Mr. Daniel Kerr, who was a member of the class of '15 during its Junior year, lost his life in the Dardanelles campaign as a lieutenant in the British army. Mr. Mugurdich S. Vorperian, an Armenian, who was a student during the year 1913-14, was murdered by the Turks in the recent Armenian massacres.

Mr. William H. P. McKenzie, a student from New Zealand in the present middle class, left soon after the opening of the term to

engage in some form of Christian service in the war.

LIBRARY NOTES

The literary output of the alumni is not so meagre as the gifts to the Alumni Alcove in the Library during the past year might suggest. For this reason the following books presented stand out the more prominently. The Rev. Dr. Thomas K. Davis, '50, has given "Mind and Spirit", Boston, 1914, and "The Thomas Davis Family", Norwood, Mass., 1912. From the Rev. Prof. M. W. Jacobus, D.D., '81, the Library has received his "Commentary on the Gospel according to Mark", of the Bible for Home and School series, New York, 1915, and from the Rev. Dr. Louis F. Benson his Stone Lectures, "The English Hymn, its Development and Use in Worship", Philadelphia, 1915, and from the Rev. Dr. Samuel G. Wilson, who was a graduate student from 1879 to 1880, "Bahaism and its Claims", New York, 1915. In addition quite a number of very welcome pamphlets have been presented by the alumni. There is room for more.

The Library lost a very efficient member of its staff by the death of Miss Isabella Hamill Gosman, July 9, 1915. Miss Gosman brought to her work an unusual degree of intelligence, education and devotion and her loss is felt severely. She was a daughter of the late Rev. Dr. Abraham Gosman, of Lawrenceville, N. J., an alumnus, at one time an instructor, and for many years a director of the Seminary.

ALUMNI NOTES

The oldest living *alumnus* is the Rev. Joseph K. Wight, of the class of 1848, who resides in Hamburg, N. Y.; but the Rev. Dr. David Tully, of the class of 1850, still holds the record as the *oldest alumnus*, having completed his 97th year last August. He is active in the ministry at his great age.

The Rev. Richard C. Morse, '67, has resigned his position as general secretary of the Y. M. C. A. International Committee, which he has held for forty years, and has been appointed consulting secretary for life.

The Rev. Robert W. Cleland, '70, has moved from Los Angeles, Cal., to Eagle Rock, Cal.

The Rev. Josiah McClain, '74, has changed

his residence from Nephi, Utah, to Salt Lake City, Utah.

The Rev. Charles A. Salmond, D.D., '79, celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of his pastorate of the South Morningside United Free Church of Edinburgh on the 22nd of January of this year.

The Rev. Harrison Clarke, '81, has suffered the loss of his wife, who died Sept. 21, 1915, at Denver, Colo.

The Rev. William M. Paden, D.D., '83, was elected moderator of the Synod of Utah at its October meeting.

The address of the Rev. James W. Parkhill, D.D., '83, has been changed from Hopkinton to Storm Lake, Ia.

The Rev. James L. McKee, D.D., '86, has moved from Wichita Falls, Kans., to Fairmount College, Weatherford, Tex.

The Rev. Daniel M. Butt, '87, after a pastorate of twenty-eight years at Britton, S. D., has resigned, and has gone to Albion, N. Y.

The Rev. J. Scott Butt, '87, twin brother of the above, has resigned from the church at Groton, S. D., after having served it for twenty-seven years.

The Rev. Marcus M. Allen, D.D., '88, pastor of the church at Ishpeming, Mich., has been elected president of the Kentucky College for Women at Danville, Ky.

The Rev. Elmer E. Reed, D.D., '88, has changed his address from Hopkinton, Ia., to Fulton, Mo.

The Rev. Walter H. Bradley, D.D., '89, has accepted a call to Casper, Wyo. He goes to this place from Chicago.

The Rev. D. Ruby Warne, '90, has been released from the Ewing Church, near Trenton, N. J., to accept a call to Lawrenceburg, Ind.

The Rev. William W. Warne, '91, goes from Jamestown, N. D., to Norwich, N. D.

The Rev. Walter H. Waygood, '91, received the honorary degree of D.D. last June from Lafayette College.

The Rev. Maitland Alexander, D.D., '92, received the honorary degree of LL.D. from the College of Wooster last June.

The wife of the Rev. William A. Shedd, '92, died, May 17, 1915, at Urumiah, Persia, of typhoid fever.

The Rev. R. L. Barackman, '95, of Storm Lake, Ia., has accepted a call to the Twentieth Century Church at Thief River Falls, Minn.

The Rev. James H. Dunham, Ph.D., '95, has been elected full time professor of philosophy in the Temple College, Philadelphia.

The Rev. John B. Laird, D.D., '95, was elected moderator of the Synod of Pennsylvania at its recent meeting.

The Rev. John McDowell, a special student during the year, 1895-96, received the honorary degree of D.D. from the College of Wooster at its last commencement.

The Rev. Mott R. Sawyers, Ph.D., '95, received the honorary degree of D.D. from Parsons College last June.

The Rev. Ray H. Carter, '98, who has been in this country on a furlough, has returned to his work in India.

Mr. S. C. K. Rutnam, '98, was compelled by serious ill health to give up his educational work in Colombo, Ceylon. His health is now restored and he is engaged in literary and editorial work in the same city.

The Rev. Richard Spetnagle, '98, has resigned the Franklin Avenue Church of Lansing, Mich.

The Rev. Samuel G. Craig, '99, pastor of the North Church of Pittsburgh, has become a member of the editorial staff of The Presbyterian of Philadelphia.

The Rev. S. E. P. White, '99, who received the honorary degree of D.D. from the College of Wooster last June, has accepted a call to the church at Longmont, Colo.

The Rev. Jacob Klaasse, '00, has moved from Clarence, N. Y., to Lockport, N. Y.

The Rev. Minot C. Morgan, '00, has resigned from the College Board to accept membership in the Board of Foreign Missions.

The Rev. Benjamin Thomas, '00, of Galesville, Wis., has accepted a call to Rush City, Minn.

The Rev. Jesse R. Zeigler, '00, who was in charge of the American Church in Frankfurt, Germany, for a year, has been called to the First Church of Indiana, Pa.

The Rev. James W. Countermeine, D.D., '01, has moved from Des Moines, Ia., to San Juan, Porto Rico, U. S. A.

The Rev. William Stuart, '01, has moved from Chicago, Ill., to Grand Rapids, Mich., where he is serving the Lagrave Avenue Christian Reformed Church.

The Rev. Harry B. Roberts, '03, celebrated in August, with his people, the 175th anniversary of the Yorktown Church, N. Y.

The Rev. Robert Robinson, '03, was installed

pastor of the church in Asbury Park, N. J., Oct. 15, 1915.

The Rev. William J. Sharpe, '03, was elected moderator of the Synod of Washington at its October meeting.

The Rev. Harold McA. Robinson, '04, and Miss Mary Breer Wiley were married June 29, 1915, in Germantown, Pa.

The Rev. Matthew F. Johnston, '04, has received the honorary degree of D.D., from the Wesleyan University of Illinois.

The Rev. Jonathan W. Purcell, D.D., '04, has gone from Palatka, Fla., to Faison, N. C.

The Rev. William C. Isett, '04, has been released from the church of Millville, N. J., that he might accept a call to the First Church of Atchison, Kas.

The Rev. George A. Brewer, '05, of Philadelphia, has accepted a call to the First Church of Duluth, Minn.

The Rev. William L. McCormick, '05, of Cambridge, O., has become pastor of the First Church of Akron, O.

The Rev. Warren R. Ward, '05, has left his charge at Mount Gilead, O., and has begun his pastorate of the Westminster Church, Philadelphia.

The Rev. David P. Cillié, a graduate student during the year 1905-06, has gone from Laingsburg, Cape Colony, South Africa, to take charge of a church in Brandtford, O. F. S., South Africa.

The Rev. George W. Arms, Jr., '06, was installed over the Harlem Church, New York, last June.

The Rev. Samuel J. M. Compton, '07, has left the St. Andrews Church in Kingston, Canada, to become a chaplain in the British army in Europe.

The Rev. Robert I. Platter, '08, late of Auburn, Ind., is now pastor of the church at Shreve, O.

The Rev. Harry B. Angus, '09, and Miss Grace Maeona Kendall were married June 16, 1915, at Meyersdale, Pa.

The Rev. Francis P. Cheek, '09, has gone from Trinity University, Waxahachie, Tex., to the chair of New Testament in Lane Seminary.

The Rev. William M. Kieffer, '09, has suffered the loss of his wife, who died Sept. 4, 1915, in the McKinley Hospital in Trenton, N. J. She left a child three months old.

The Rev. Robert S. Sidebotham, '09, has ac-

cepted a call to the church of East Jordan, Mich.

The Rev. George A. Leukel, '10, has accepted a call to the church at Little Britain, Pa.

The Rev. John H. Frahey, '12, and Miss Florence Halvorson were married Aug. 25, 1915, in Duluth, Minn.

The Rev. John Muyskens, Jr., '12, has accepted a call to the Reformed church at Piermont, N. Y.

The Rev. Gilbert L. Kerr, a graduate student during the year 1912-13, and Miss Eleanor Martin were married June 30, 1915, at Newberry, S. C.

The Rev. Luther M. Bicknell, '13, is pastor of the Rainier Beach Presbyterian Church of Seattle, Wash.

The Rev. Warren J. Conrad, '13, is pastor of the church at Liberty, N. Y.

The Rev. John C. Ely, '13, and Miss Margaret Hawley were married March 23, 1915, in Wilkinsburg, Pa. They are at home in Mineral, Wash.

The Rev. Robert W. Baskerville, '15, and Miss Nettie Marie Anderson were married on October 27, 1915, at Doylestown, Pa.

The Rev. Ralph W. Hand, '15, is pastor of the church at Riverdale, Md.

The Rev. Joseph E. Kennedy, '15, was ordained by the Presbytery of Providence, June 21, 1915, and installed pastor of the church at Lonsdale, R. I., on the evening of the same day.

News of the death of the following alumni since the issue of the last Necrological Report has been received.

'54-55. The Rev. David Hall, D.D., a graduate student, died Sept. 7, 1915, in Aspinwall, Ia.

'58. The Rev. Lewis Carter Baker died April 6, 1915, in Princeton, N. J.

'58. The Rev. Floyd Augustus Crane, Ph.D., died April 21, 1915, in Goshen, N. Y.

'59. The Rev. Alexander Scott died Feb. 16, 1915, in New Concord, O.

'60. The Rev. Daniel Seely Gregory, D.D., LL.D., died April 14, 1915, in East Orange, N. J.

'61. The Rev. John Fleming Cowan, D.D., died April 5, 1915, near Calwood, Mo.

'62. The Rev. James Smith McDonald,

D.D., died May 13, 1915, in Corte Madera, Cal.

'62. The Rev. Charles Tabele McMullin died April 16, 1915, in Philadelphia, Pa.

'63. The Rev. Ezra Fitch Pabody died Sept. 28, 1915, at his home on Lake Minnetonka, Minn.

'64. The Rev. James Hervey Appleton died July 15, 1915, in Brooklyn, N. Y.

'64. The Rev. Henry Edward Butler, D.D., died April 25, 1915, in Chicago, Ill.

'64. The Rev. William Henry Edwards died June 16, 1915, in Clifton, Va.

'64. The Rev. Arthur Little, D.D., died April 11, 1915, in West Newton, Mass.

'65. The Rev. Snyder Binns Simes died July 18, 1915, in Falmouth Heights, Mass.

'65. The Rev. John Elliott Wright, D.D., died June 10, 1915, in Markleton, Pa.

'66. The Rev. Daniel R. Foster died Oct. 25, 1915, at his home in Trenton, N. J.

'68. The Rev. Matthew Bonsall Lowrie, D.D., died May 26, 1915, in Chicago, Ill.

'70. The Rev. Edward Rothesay Miller died Aug. 7, 1915, in East Hampton, L. I., N. Y.

'70. The Rev. John Howard O'Brien died Sept. 23, 1915, in Clarksboro, N. J.

'72. The Rev. Samuel Parry died Sept. 9, 1915, in Somerville, N. J.

'77. The Rev. James Julius Chisolm, D.D., died Aug. 10, 1915, in Natchez, Miss.

'80. The Rev. James Calhoun Elliott died Sept. 25, 1915, in Newburgh, N. Y.

'83. The Rev. Paul David Bergen, D.D., died Aug. 8, 1915, in West Avon, Conn.

'83. The Rev. John Francis Dustan died June 10, 1915, in Bridgetown, N. S., Canada.

'86. The Rev. John Edward Harries, late pastor of the North Street Congregational Church of Ferndale, Glamorgan, So. Wales. Date and place unknown.

'87. The Rev. Albert Barnes Williamson died July 25, 1915, in Bloomsbury, N. J.

'89. The Rev. James Anderson Beattie went down with the Lusitania when it was torpedoed by the Germans near the coast of Ireland, May 7, 1915.

'90. The Rev. James Samuel Edwin Erskine died Aug. 9, 1915, in Thompson Ridge, N. Y.

'90. The Rev. John Berridge McCuish, Ph.D., D.D., died June 29, 1915, in Newton, Kans.

'93. The Rev. Henry McKnight Moore was drowned Aug. 18, 1915, in the Delaware River near Lambertville, N. J., when his canoe was overturned in the rapids near that city.

'99. The Rev. Samuel Dougherty Manifold died March 13, 1915, in Woodbine, Pa.

'13. The Rev. Mugurdich Sarkis Vorperian, a partial student during the year 1913-14, was murdered by the Turks in Armenia in July, 1915.

'14. Indu Prakas Bannerji, a partial student, 1914-15, went down with the Lusitania when it was torpedoed by the Germans near the coast of Ireland, May 7, 1915.

'15. Daniel Kerr, who was in Princeton Seminary during his junior year, was lost in action at the Dardanelles some time during the summer of 1915.

Princeton Theological Seminary Library



1 1012 01467 8405

FOR USE IN LIBRARY ONLY

PERIODICALS

FOR USE IN LIBRARY ONLY

FOR USE IN LIBRARY ONLY

